

# SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN WATERMASTER

## REGULAR BOARD MEETING AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 2011 - 2:00 P.M.

### MEETING LOCATION

MONTEREY REGIONAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY

BOARD ROOM, 5 HARRIS COURT, BUILDING "D"

"RYAN RANCH"

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

### **WATERMASTER BOARD:**

Coastal Subarea Landowner – Director Paul Bruno, Chair

City of Sand City – Mayor David Pendergrass, Vice Chair

California American Water – Director Craig Anthony

City of Seaside – Mayor Felix Bachofner

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District – Director Bob Brower

Laguna Seca Subarea Landowner – Director Bob Costa

City of Monterey – Mayor Chuck Della Sala

City of Del Rey Oaks – Mayor Jerry Edelen

Monterey County/Monterey County Water Resources Agency – Supervisor Dave Potter, District 5

### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

### **II. ROLL CALL**

### **III. MINUTES**

The minutes of the Regular Board meeting of May 4, 2011 are attached to this agenda. The Board is requested to consider approving the minutes.

### **IV. REVIEW OF AGENDA**

If there are any items that arose after the 72-hour posting deadline, a vote may be taken to add the item to the agenda pursuant to the requirements of Government Code Section 54954.2(b). (A 2/3-majority vote is required).

### **V. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

Oral communications is on each meeting agenda in order to provide members of the public an opportunity to address the Watermaster on matters within its jurisdiction. Matters not appearing on the agenda will not receive action at this meeting but may be referred to the Watermaster Administrator or may be set for a future meeting. Presentations will be limited to three minutes or as otherwise established by the Watermaster. In order that the speaker may be identified in the minutes of the meeting, it is helpful if speakers would use the microphone and state their names. Oral communications are now open.

### **VI. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**A.** Consider Approval of Summary for Payments made during May, June, July and August, 2011 totaling \$50,813.25.

**B.** Consider Fiscal Year Financial Reports through August 31, 2011

**C.** Consider Approval of RFS No. 2011-04 with Monterey Peninsula Water Management District for \$6,375 to perform modifications to the Watermaster Database to change from its current on-line interactive format to an Access-based format.

### **VII. ORAL PRESENTATION**

None Scheduled

**VIII. OLD BUSINESS**

- A. Discuss and Consider Approving Revisions to Rules and Regulations as requested by Board of Directors; specifically the need to have both the beginning and ending water meter readings submitted by producers for monthly water production from the Basin

**IX. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**1. TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)**

- a). Discuss and Consider Approving Storage and Recovery Agreement with California American Water
- b). Discuss and Consider Temporarily Eliminating the Public Member Position on the TAC

**X. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS (No Action Required)**

- A. Timeline Schedule of Milestone Dates (Critical date monitoring)
- B. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) minutes from May 11, June 8 and August 10, 2011 meetings.
- C. Water Production Report for Third Quarter Water Year 2010-2011 (April 1, 2011 through June 30, 2011)
- D. TAC Review of Possible Supplemental Water Projects the Watermaster could be working
- E. Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD) Report of First and Second Quarter Water Year 2011, Groundwater-Quality and Groundwater-Level Data Collected for the Seaside Groundwater Basin

**XI. DIRECTOR'S REPORTS**

**XII. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMENTS**

**XIII. NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE—OCTOBER 5, 2011 (MRWPCA-Board Room) 2:00 P.M.**

**XIV. ADJOURNMENT**

This agenda was forwarded via e-mail to the City Clerks of Seaside, Monterey, Sand City and Del Rey Oaks; the Clerk of the Monterey Board of Supervisors, the Clerk to the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District; the Clerk at the Monterey County Water Resources Agency, Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency and the California American Water Company for posting on September 2, 2011 per the Ralph M. Brown Act, Government Code Section 54954.2(a).

**ITEM NO. III.**

**MINUTES**

**REGULAR MEETING**  
Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster  
*May 4, 2011*

**DRAFT MINUTES**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Vice Chairman Pendergrass called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m. in the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency Boardroom at 5 Harris Court, Building D, Monterey.

**II. ROLL CALL**

California American Water (“CAW”) – Director Craig Anthony  
City of Seaside – Mayor Felix Bachofner  
City of Del Rey Oaks – Mayor Jerry Edelen  
Laguna Seca Subarea Landowner – Bob Costa  
City of Monterey – Mayor Charles “Chuck” Della Sala  
City of Sand City – Mayor David Pendergrass  
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (“MPWMD”) – Director Bob Brower  
Monterey County/Monterey County Water Resources Agency (“MCWRA”) – Supervisor Dave Potter

Absent: Coastal Subarea Landowner – Director Paul Bruno, Chair

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Ray Corpuz, Chair, Watermaster Budget/Finance Committee  
Don Freeman, City of Seaside  
Joe Oliver, MPWMD  
Rick Reidel, City of Seaside  
Lori Gerard, Legal Counsel, CAW  
Brenda Lewis, MPWMD

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Moved by Supervisor Potter, seconded by Mayor Della Sala, and the motion was carried to approve the minutes of the Watermaster regular meeting held February 2, 2011. Mayor Bachofner recused himself since he had not attended the February meeting.**

**IV. REVIEW OF AGENDA**

There were no requested changes to the agenda.

**V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

Vice Chair Pendergrass congratulated Ms. Brenda Lewis as a new MPWMD board member.

**VI. CONSENT CALENDAR**

- A.** Consider Approval of Summary for Payments made during February, March and April 2011 totaling **\$20,845.00**
- B.** Consider Fiscal Year Financial Reports through April 30, 2011

**Moved by Mayor Edelen, seconded by Supervisor Potter, and unanimously carried, to approve the consent calendar as presented.**

## VII. **ORAL PRESENTATION**

Darby Fuerst, General Manager of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District presented an update on Seaside Basin Aquifer Storage and Recovery (“ASR”) being undertaken by MPWMD and California American Water. The ASR project first began in 1996. Assessed parameters that CAW needed to undertake storage and injection into the Basin included: 1) availability of water; 2) production capacity; 3) treatment capacity; 4) transmission capacity; and 5) storage capacity. With the advent of the Basin Adjudication and approximately 50,000 acre-feet of unused storage capacity to be allotted to involved parties, the fifth parameter of storage capacity was obtained by CAW and the ASR project could commence. The feasibility of a phased approach was undertaken. Specialized dual-purpose wells for both injection and recovery at each well would be needed.

The intent of the project was to benefit the Carmel River and the Steelhead population. A side benefit of water storage in the Basin would be achieved however recharge was not part of the intent of the project.

The water resources system of the Monterey Peninsula included the regional watershed, the Seaside Basin aquifer, and the alluvial groundwater aquifer under the Carmel River. The State Water Resources Board asserted jurisdiction over the Carmel River aquifer. CAW derived 70% of its production from the Carmel River and 30% from the Seaside Groundwater Basin.

The recent focus of injections was into the Santa Margarita formation of the aquifer.

Joe Oliver of MPWMD gave an overview of the current ASR infrastructure. Under Phase I, two wells that operated as a couplet were in place at a Fort Ord site located between two “coalesced” aquifer pockets. Approval of full site development was achieved including the ability to treat water prior to injection. The facility building was under construction and would be the site for future ASR wells. Phase II of the project on backflow mode would send water to the Phase I site; ways to increase the capabilities of the site were being addressed. Upon completion of Phase III, 6 wells would be located at three sites. CAW would need to increase its number of wells to have enough production capacity to move to Phase III. MPWMD would be working with CAW to determine additional pipeline capacity needs.

Director Costa asked what the minimum flow requirement was for the Carmel River. Mr. Fuerst stated that in arranging the water rights for the second phase of the program, involved agencies were working to simplify the minimum flow. Currently, minimum flow at the downstream gauge at the Highway 1 Bridge from December 1 until the Lagoon opened was 40 cubic feet per second (“cfs”). From when the Lagoon opened to April 15<sup>th</sup>, the minimum flow was 120 cfs. From April 16<sup>th</sup> to May 30<sup>th</sup> was 80 cfs, and from May 31 to November 30 the river was closed off by the State under its determination that it was over allocated.

## VIII. **OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business.

## IX. NEW BUSINESS

### A. COMMITTEE REPORTS

#### 1. RULES AND REGULATIONS COMMITTEE

Revision of Rules and Regulations document to include language that addressed the membership of the Technical Advisory Committee - Mr. Evans stated that the committee consisted of Mayor Pendergrass, Director Costa, past director Lehman who had not been replaced, and Mr. Heisinger who had developed the original Rules and Regulations document. The red-lined changes presented had been emailed in advance to all committee members. No responses were received with the exception of Mayor Pendergrass.

It was Director Anthony's understanding that the public member of the TAC was required to live inside the boundaries of the Basin and that the stipulation had not been included in the Rules and Regulation revisions presented. Mr. Evans stated that he would include the stipulation as a revision. Under section 6.4 on page 9, fourth sentence, he felt that the word "initial" should be removed from "...the initial one-time..."

Director Anthony pointed out that the agenda item wording was specific to addressing the membership of the TAC. The changes made outside of that scope had not been noted on the agenda and therefore should not be considered for action at the meeting. He took exception to the change made to section 11.0, second sentence - ... *and the corresponding beginning and ending water meter readings that were used to calculate these quantities...*, stating that the reporting requirement significantly affected parties, especially CAW with the bulk of the wells and paying 91% of the fees to Watermaster. Mr. Evans responded that meter readings being used for production reporting would standardize the procedures and ensure that Watermaster could accurately calculate reported production to in-turn report production and replenishment assessments to the parties and to the judge.

Mr. Freeman stated that the board could consider the uncontested changes to the Rules and Regulations today, then bring back the issue of meter readings at a subsequent meeting.

**Moved by Director Brower, seconded by Director Costa, and carried, with Director Anthony voting no, to approve the revisions to the Watermaster Rules and Regulations with the noted non-substantive changes to be made, and with the exception of the requirement to provide meter readings when reporting production.**

## X. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS (No Action Required)

- A. Timeline Schedule of Milestone Dates (Critical date monitoring)
- B. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) minutes from February 9 and March 9, 2011 meetings

XI. **DIRECTORS' REPORTS**

There were no directors' reports.

XII. **EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMENTS**

The Technical Advisory Committee regular meeting would be held Wednesday, May 11, 2011 in the MPWMD conference room at 1:30 p.m.

XIII. **NEXT MEETING DATE – It was agreed that the next Regular Meeting would be held on Wednesday, June 1, 2011, at the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) Board meeting room at 5 Harris Court, Building "D" on Ryan Ranch in Monterey at 2:00 p.m.**

XIV. There being no further business, Vice Chairman Pendergrass adjourned the meeting at 3:06 p.m.

**ITEM NO. VI.**

**CONSENT CALENDAR**



**SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN  
WATERMASTER**

**TO:** Board of Directors

**FROM:** Dewey D Evans, CEO

**DATE:** September 7, 2011

**SUBJECT:** Summary of Payments Authorized to be paid during the period from May 1, 2011 through August 31, 2011

---

**PURPOSE:**

To advise the Board of payments authorized to be paid during the period from May 1, 2011 through August 31, 2011.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Consider approving the payment of bills submitted and authorized to be paid during the period from May 1, 2011 through August 31, 2011.

**COMMENTS and FISCAL IMPACT:**

**May, 2011**

**DDEvans Consulting** (Professional Services Agreement—CEO)—April 26, 2011 through May 23, 2011 worked on Watermaster business a total of 42.5 hours at \$100.00 per hour or **\$4,250.00**. Responded to telephone inquiries, e-mail, and other correspondence as needed regarding the Seaside Basin. Prepared and sent out Board agenda packet; attended and provided follow-up action from May 4, 2011 Board meeting. Prepared and delivered bills to City of Seaside for payment. Worked on revisions to Rules and Regulations as directed by the Board of Directors. Received, reviewed and discussed with Bob Jaques the TAC meeting agenda material. Sent out email requesting agenda items for June 1<sup>st</sup> regular Board meeting.

**Robert “Bob” Jaques** (Technical Program Manager)—April 18, 2011 through May 24, 2011 worked on Watermaster business a total of 14.0 hours at \$100.00 per hour or **\$1,400.00**. Worked on preparing TAC meeting agenda materials, attended TAC meeting of May 11, 2011 and did follow-up work. Prepared and emailed out TAC meeting minutes

Total for May, 2011

**\$5,650.00**

**June, 2011**

**DDEvans Consulting** (Professional Services Agreement—CEO)—May 25, 2011 through June 24, 2011 worked on Watermaster business a total of 37.0 hours at \$100.00 per hour or **\$3,700.00**. Responded to telephone inquiries, e-mail, and other correspondence as needed regarding the Seaside Basin. Sent out cancellation notice of June 1, 2011 Board meeting to all parties. Updated e-mail file

addresses; paid monthly bills. Worked on revised Rules and Regulations. Received, reviewed and discussed the TAC agenda packet with Bob Jaques. Discussed storage agreement with Director Anthony of CalAm. Sent out request for Board agenda items for July 6, 2011 regular meeting to all Board and Interested Parties. Sent out notice to all water producers reminding them of monthly and quarterly water production reports and water level reports due by July 15<sup>th</sup>. meeting Discussed lack of agenda items with Chair Bruno. Sent out notice of cancellation of July 6th regular Board meeting because of lack of meaningful agenda items needing Board consideration.

**Robert “Bob” Jaques** (Technical Program Manager)—May 25, 2011 through June 16, 2011 worked on Watermaster business a total of 31.0 hours at \$100.00 per hour or **\$3,100.00**. Working on TAC agenda issues; met with Keith Israel and Bob Holden at MRWPCA re: RUWAP and GWRP Projects status; review materials they provided re: these projects. Prepared RFS for MPWMD for database work. Prepared for and attended June 8, 2011 TAC meeting with time later spent on follow-up matters. Begin preparing draft Annual Report for WY 2011. Met with Laura Dadiw and Dean Paxton regarding Watermaster web site and Database issues. Prepared and emailed minutes from June 8<sup>th</sup> TAC meeting.

Total for June, 2011

**\$6,800.00**

### **July, 2011**

**DDEvans Consulting** (Professional Services Agreement—CEO—June 27, 2011 through July 25, 2011 worked on Watermaster business a total of 34.0 hours at \$100.00 per hour or **\$3,400.00**. Responded to telephone inquiries, e-mail and other correspondence as needed regarding the Seaside Basin. Worked on meeting agenda for next regular Board of Director’s meeting, scheduled for August 3, 2011. Sent out request for Board agenda items for August 3, 2011 regular meeting to Board and others on July 20<sup>th</sup>. Sent out regular Board meeting cancellation notice for July 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. Met with Bob Jaques regarding RFS with MPWMD to update Watermaster database files. Prepared and delivered monthly billings to City of Seaside for payment. Spent time preparing Board agenda reports for next Board meeting. Sent out email reminder notices to appropriate water level and water producers due in office by July 15<sup>th</sup>. Received and reviewed water production and water level reports. Discussed August 3<sup>rd</sup> regular meeting agenda with Chairman Bruno. Several discussions with Craig Anthony, Paul Bruno, Bob Jaques, Joe Oliver, Laura and Rose Little regarding CalAm’s storage agreement and related documents. Received and reviewed CalAm’s storage agreement and related papers.

**Robert “Bob” Jaques** (Technical Program Manager)—June 26, 2011 through July 28, 2011 worked on Watermaster business a total of 31.0 hours at \$100.00 per hour or **\$3,100.00**. Working on TAC issues; made arrangements for August 10<sup>th</sup> TAC meeting. Worked on and completed RFS with MPWMD regarding Watermaster Database refinement issues. Prepared and emailed information to Central Coast Surveyors on wellhead resurvey work. Prepared and emailed information to CAW and MPWMD on Storage Agreement issues. Met with D. Edson at Central Coast Surveyors regarding wellhead resurvey work; delivered signed copy of MPWMD RFS to Watermaster office. Worked on CAW’s Storage Application and related documents. Prepared State Parks Permit Renewal application for Sentinel Well monitoring.

**HydroMetrics Water Resources Inc.**— Invoice for two hours of work for **\$340.00** to review ASR wells injection option and discuss same with Bob Jaques.

Total for July, 2011

**\$6,840.00**

**August, 2011**

**DDEvans Consulting** (Professional Services Agreement—CEO—July 26, 2011 through August 24, 2011 worked on Watermaster business a total of 46.0 hours at \$100.00 per hour or **\$4,600.00**. Responded to telephone inquiries, email and other correspondence as needed regarding the Seaside Basin. Worked on meeting agenda for next regular Board of Director’s meeting, scheduled for September 7, 2011. Sent out request for Board agenda items for September 7, 2011 regular meeting to some Board members and others as appropriate. Prepared and delivered monthly billings to City of Seaside for payment. Spent time preparing September 7<sup>th</sup> Board agenda and agenda items. Received and reviewed TAC agenda packet for August 10<sup>th</sup> meeting date. Attended August 10<sup>th</sup> TAC meeting and made appropriate follow-up actions where necessary. Discussions with Dan Dawson of Del Rey Oaks regarding water rights and prepared paperwork for his review and follow-up. Received and reviewed invoices from MPWMD with Bob Jaques for six months of services from January 1, 2011 through June 30, 2011 totaling \$24,948.25. Received and reviewed TAC meeting minutes from August 10<sup>th</sup>. Sent meeting minute corrections to Bob Jaques. Met with Dan Dawson from Del Rey Oaks and went over water right correspondence with him and Laura.

**Robert “Bob” Jaques** (Technical Program Manager)—August 1, 2011 through August 22, 2011 worked on Watermaster business a total of 19.75 hours at \$100.00 per hour or **\$1,975.00**. Worked on preparing TAC meeting agenda packet and emailed out to members. Received and responded to emails and telecons on TAC issues. Picked up new Access Permit from State Parks Department offices, scan and emailed to Martin Feeny and Joe Oliver for Sentinel Well work. Prepared for and attended August 10<sup>th</sup> TAC meeting. Reviewed and approved and sent MPWMD invoices to CEO for payment. Met with Joe Oliver at MPWMD offices regarding Monitoring and Management Work Plan and Budget issues for fiscal year 2012. Prepared and emailed out TAC meeting minutes, worked on M&MP Budget and began work on September TAC agenda.

**Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD)**—Three invoices were submitted for payment covering the first six months of calendar year 2011 (January 1 through June 30) totaling **\$24,948.25**. The amounts billed include performing water level and water quality data collection for specified wells within the Seaside Basin and for performing certain tasks contained in the Watermaster’s Monitoring and Management Plan for 2011. The third invoice was for contacting, coordinating, accompanying and reviewing the work done relating to the 2011 Wellhead Elevation Surveys conducted by Central Coast Surveyors.

Total for August, 2011 **\$31,523.25**

Grand total for the period between May 1, 2011 through August 31, 2011 **\$50,813.25**

**Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster**  
**Budget vs. Actual Administrative Fund**  
 Fiscal Year (January 1 - December 31, 2011)  
 Balance through August 31, 2011

	<u>2011 Adopted Budget</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>	<u>Year to Date Revenue / Expenses</u>
<b>Available Balances &amp; Assessments</b>			
Dedicated Reserve	25,000.00		25,000.00
FY (Rollover)	60,000.00		66,125.00
FY Assessments	45,000.00		38,520.00
<b>Available</b>	<b><u>130,000.00</u></b>		<b><u>129,645.00</u></b>
<b>Expenses</b>			
Contract Staff	80,000.00	80,000.00	25,950.00
Legal Advisor	25,000.00	-	-
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b><u>105,000.00</u></b>	<b><u>80,000.00</u></b>	<b><u>25,950.00</u></b>
<b>Total Available</b>	25,000.00		
<b>Dedicated Reserve</b>	<u>25,000.00</u>		
<b>Net Available</b>	<u>-</u>		

Administrative Fund Assessments owed by City of Seaside  
 FY 2011 (including 5% penalty) 6,804

**Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster**  
**Budget vs. Actual Monitoring & Management - Operations Fund**  
 Fiscal Year (January 1 - December 31, 2011)  
 Balance through August 31, 2011

	<u>2011 Adopted Budget</u>	<u>Contract Encumbrance</u>	<u>Year to Date Revenue/Expenses</u>
<b>Available Balances &amp; Assessments</b>			
Monitoring & Management - Ops Fund	\$ 360,040.00	\$ -	\$ 331,236.80
FY 2010 Rollover	236,010.00	-	236,010.00
<b>Total Available</b>	<b>\$ 596,050.00</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 567,246.80</b>
<b>Appropriations &amp; Expenses</b>			
<b>GENERAL</b>			
Technical Project Manager	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 19,925.00
Contingency @ 20% (not including TPM )	43,340.00	43,340.00	-
<b>Total General</b>	<b>\$ 143,340.00</b>	<b>\$ 143,340.00</b>	<b>\$ 19,925.00</b>
<b>CONSULTANTS (Hydrometrics)</b>			
Program Administration	\$ 8,250.00		
Production/Lvl/Qty Monitoring	4,150.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 820.00
Basin Management Action Plan	85,000.00		
Seawater Intrusion Contingency Plan	27,800.00	22,020.00	-
<b>Total Consultants</b>	<b>\$ 125,200.00</b>	<b>\$ 34,020.00</b>	<b>\$ 820.00</b>
<b>MPWMD</b>			
Production/Lvl/Qty Monitoring	\$ 87,800.00	77,410.00	\$ 2,337.50
Basin Management	-	4,140.00	21,800.75
Seawater Intrusion	3,700.00	3,600.00	-
Direct Costs	-	-	-
<b>Total MPWMD</b>	<b>\$ 91,500.00</b>	<b>\$ 85,150.00</b>	<b>\$ 24,138.25</b>
<b>Transfer Out to Capital Fund</b>			
			-
<b>Total Appropriations &amp; Expenses</b>	<b>\$ 360,040.00</b>	<b>\$ 262,510.00</b>	<b>\$ 44,883.25</b>
<b>Total Available</b>	<b>236,010.00</b>		

Operations Fund Assessments owed by City of Seaside  
 FY 2011 (including 5% penalty)

26,463

**Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster  
 Budget vs. Actual Monitoring and Management - Capital Fund  
 Fiscal Year (January 1 - December 31, 2011)  
 Balance through August 31, 2011**

VI.B.  
 9/7/2011

	<b>2011 Adopted Budget</b>	<b>Contract Encumbrance</b>	<b>Year to Date Revenue / Expense</b>
<b>Available Balances and Assessments:</b>			
Monitoring & Management Fund - Capital	\$ -		\$ -
FY 2007-2010 Rollover to 2011	5,499		5,499
Transfer in from Operations Fund	-		-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<u>5,499</u>		<u>5,499</u>
<b>Appropriations &amp; Expenses:</b>			
Professional Services			
Project Management	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
Direct Costs			
Well Drilling -	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
<b>Total Appropriations and Expenses</b>	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ -</u>
<b>Total Available</b>	<u><u>\$ -</u></u>		
<b>Capital Fund Assessments owed by City of Seaside</b>			
FY 2009 (including 5% penalty)	16,538		
<b>Total</b>	<u><u>\$ 16,538</u></u>		

## Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster

VI.B

## Replenishment Fund

9/7/2011

Water Year 2011 (October 1 - September 30) / Fiscal Year (January 1 - December 31, 2011)

January 1 - August 31, 2011

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Totals Through WY 2010	Proposed Budget 2011	Projected Totals Through WY 2011
<b>Replenishment Fund</b>								
Assessments:	WY 05/06	WY 06/07	WY 07/08	WY 08/09	WY 09/10		WY 10/11	
Unit Cost:	\$1,132	\$1,132	\$2,485	\$3,040	\$2,780		\$2,780	
<b>California American Water Balance Forward</b>	\$ -	\$ 1,641,004	\$ 4,206,475	\$ (2,900,435)	\$ (2,868,685)		\$ (3,850,964)	
Exceeding Natural Safe Yield Considering Alternative Producers	2,106,652	2,484,533	5,164,969	3,773,464	4,112,933	\$ 17,642,552	3,319,320	\$ 20,961,872
Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment	-	80,938	34,045	-	-	114,983	-	114,983
<b>Total California American</b>	<b>\$ 2,106,652</b>	<b>\$ 2,565,471</b>	<b>\$ 5,199,014</b>	<b>\$ 3,773,464</b>	<b>\$ 4,112,933</b>	<b>\$ 17,757,535</b>	<b>\$ 3,319,320</b>	<b>\$ 21,076,855</b>
CAW Credit Against Assessment	(465,648)		(12,305,924)	\$ (3,741,714)	(5,095,213)	(21,608,499)	-	(21,608,499)
<b>CAW Unpaid Balance</b>	<b>\$ 1,641,004</b>	<b>\$ 4,206,475</b>	<b>\$ (2,900,435)</b>	<b>\$ (2,868,685)</b>	<b>\$ (3,850,964)</b>	<b>\$ (3,850,964)</b>	<b>\$ (531,644)</b>	<b>\$ (531,644)</b>
<b>City of Seaside Balance Forward</b>	\$ -	\$ 230,671	\$ 413,454	\$ 1,106,116	\$ 1,737,569		\$ 1,280,954	
<b>City of Seaside Municipal</b>								
Exceeding Natural Safe Yield Considering Alternative Producers	169,200	173,739	385,642	399,211	370,296	\$ 1,498,088	369,740	\$ 1,867,828
Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment	50,487	340	16,898	66,090	61,438	195,253	61,438	256,691
<b>Total Municipal</b>	<b>219,687</b>	<b>174,079</b>	<b>402,540</b>	<b>465,300</b>	<b>431,734</b>	<b>1,693,340</b>	<b>431,178</b>	<b>2,124,518</b>
<b>City of Seaside - Golf Courses</b>								
Exceeding Natural Safe Yield - Alternative Producer	-	-	131,705	69,701	-	201,406	-	201,406
Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment	-	-	131,705	69,701	-	201,406	-	201,406
<b>Total Golf Courses</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>263,410</b>	<b>139,402</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>402,812</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>402,812</b>
<b>Total City of Seaside*</b>	<b>\$ 219,687</b>	<b>\$ 174,079</b>	<b>\$ 665,950</b>	<b>\$ 604,702</b>	<b>\$ 431,734</b>	<b>\$ 2,096,152</b>	<b>\$ 431,178</b>	<b>\$ 2,527,330</b>
City of Seaside Late Payment 5%	10,984	8,704	26,712	26,750		73,150		73,150
In-lieu Credit Against Assessment	-		-	\$ -	(888,349)	(888,349)	-	(888,349)
<b>City of Seaside Unpaid Balance</b>	<b>\$ 230,671</b>	<b>\$ 413,454</b>	<b>\$ 1,106,116</b>	<b>\$ 1,737,569</b>	<b>\$ 1,280,954</b>	<b>\$ 1,280,954</b>	<b>\$ 1,712,132</b>	<b>\$ 1,712,132</b>
<b>Total Replenishment Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$ 1,871,675</b>	<b>\$ 4,619,929</b>	<b>\$ (1,794,319)</b>	<b>\$ (1,131,116)</b>	<b>\$ (2,570,011)</b>	<b>\$ (2,570,011)</b>	<b>\$ 1,180,487</b>	<b>\$ 1,180,487</b>
<b>Replenishment Fund Balance Forward</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$ 1,871,675</b>	<b>\$ 4,619,929</b>	<b>\$ (1,794,319)</b>	<b>\$ (1,131,116)</b>		<b>\$ (2,570,011)</b>	
<b>Total Replenishment Assessments</b>	<b>2,337,323</b>	<b>2,748,254</b>	<b>5,891,676</b>	<b>4,404,917</b>	<b>4,544,667</b>	<b>19,926,837</b>	<b>3,750,498</b>	<b>23,677,335</b>
<b>Total Replenishment Paid and/or Credited</b>	<b>(465,648)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(12,305,924)</b>	<b>(3,741,714)</b>	<b>(5,983,562)</b>	<b>(22,496,848)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(22,496,848)</b>
<b>MRWPCA GWRP Payment</b>								<b>(100,000)</b>
<b>Grand Total Replenishment Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$ 1,871,675</b>	<b>\$ 4,619,929</b>	<b>\$ (1,794,319)</b>	<b>\$ (1,131,116)</b>	<b>\$ (2,570,011)</b>	<b>(2,570,011)</b>	<b>\$ 1,180,487</b>	<b>\$ 1,080,487</b>

**SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN  
WATERMASTER**

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Robert S. Jaques, Technical Program Manager  
MODIFIED AND APPROVED BY: Dewey D Evans, CEO

DATE: September 7, 2011

SUBJECT: Consider Approval of RFS No. 2011-04 with MPWMD to Perform Database Revisions  
-----

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Authorize Watermaster staff to execute the attached RFS No. 2011-04 to MPWMD to carry out this work for a not-to-exceed cost of \$6,375. Funds to perform this work are available in the adopted Fiscal Year 2011 Watermaster Budget.

**BACKGROUND:**

At its May 11, 2011 meeting the TAC approved a scope of work to have MPWMD populate the Watermaster's Database with data that is not currently in it, and to change how the Database is formatted and managed.

Including data that is currently not in the Database, but which exists in the databases of other local agencies, would serve to make the Watermaster's Database more comprehensive.

Changing the format and management of the Watermaster's Database from its current on-line interactive format to an Access-based format would reduce staff time spent in managing the Database while still providing full access to the data to interested members of the public.

**DISCUSSION:**

It was originally intended to provide this Agenda item for approval at the Board's June 1, 2011 meeting. However, the Board cancelled that meeting due to a lack of sufficient agenda items to warrant holding a meeting.

The cost of the RFS falls within the authorization given to the Chief Executive Officer to execute contracts, and to have them subsequently ratified by the Board at its next meeting. The Board typically defers to the TAC on detailed issues such as those involved in the proposed Database changes, and implementing these changes will improve the cost-efficiency of managing the Database. For these reasons the RFS was issued to MPWMD in early July, and is on the Consent Agenda for Board ratification.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

MPWMD RFS No. 2011-04



SEASIDE BASIN WATERMASTER  
REQUEST FOR SERVICE

**DATE:** July 7, 2011

**RFS NO.** 2011-04

(To be filled in by WATERMASTER)

**TO:** Joe Oliver  
MPWMD

**FROM:** Robert Jaques  
Watermaster

**Services Needed and Purpose:**

Perform services to modify the Watermaster's Database. A detailed Scope of Work is attached as Attachment 1.

**Completion Date:** Work to be completed within 60 days from the date of execution of this RFS No. 2011-04.

**Method of Compensation:** Time and Expense Payment Method (As defined in Section V of Agreement. See Attachment 2 for a description of these costs.)

**Total Price** Authorized by this RFS: \$6,375.00 (Cost is authorized only when evidenced by signature below.)

**Total Price** may not be exceeded without prior written authorization by WATERMASTER in accordance with Section V. COMPENSATION.

**Requested by:** \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
WATERMASTER Technical Program Manager

**Authorized by:** \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
WATERMASTER Chief Executive Officer

**Agreed to by:** \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
PROFESSIONAL

# **ATTACHMENT 1**

## **Scope of Work for RFS No. 2011-04**

### **Background:**

The WATERMASTER has evaluated its Database and has determined to make certain modifications to the format and management of it. As part of this work, the Database will be changed from its current on-line interactive format to an Access-based format. Currently the Database is interactive in that a party can sort and select certain portions of the data and download it in either Excel or .pdf format to meet their specific needs. Under the new Access Database approach, all of the information on the website will only be downloadable in Excel format, so the party can do their own sorting and selecting of that portion of the data that they wish to use. Thus, the “interactivity” of the current on-line Database will be preserved, just in a slightly differ manner.

### **Work to be Performed by the PROFESSIONAL Under this RFS No. 2011-04:**

Under this RFS No. 2011-04 the PROFESSIONAL will carry out the Tasks described below:

#### **TASK 1. PREPARE REPORTS**

**A. Well Information Report:** The “static” historical information that is currently in the on-line Database, e.g. basic information that generally does not change with time such as the locations and physical characteristics of wells, well owner contact information, and well construction documents, will be included in the Access Database, similarly to how it is currently included in the on-line Database. This will be accomplished by having the PROFESSIONAL create a new Report containing this information within the Access Database. The information that is currently available to the general public at the Watermaster’s website, comprised of the items listed below, will continue to be accessible:

#### **Well List, including:**

1. Watermaster Well ID No.
2. State Well No.
3. Well Name
4. Well Owner

#### **Contacts, including:**

1. Company Name
2. Common Name
3. Address
4. Telephone No.
5. FAX No.
6. Contact Person
7. Email address
8. Owner Type
9. License No. (for drillers)
10. Comments

Other information, such as well construction details, which are currently only accessible to persons with an Access Level password, will continue to be accessible to those persons, using the access approach described under Task 4.

**B. Water Quality and Water Level Reports:** Each quarter data from the PROFESSIONAL’s Quarterly Water Quality (WQ) and Water Level (WL) reports will be placed on the WATERMASTER’s website. The posted data will be ongoing, not just covering the most recent quarter, so historical quality and level information will be available to interested parties on-line. The reports will be posted only in Excel format. The data that is posted will be just the data itself, not the narrative analysis that is included in the quarterly reports, since the WATERMASTER already posts the complete WQ and WL reports on its website when it posts its Board meeting agenda packets. The PROFESSIONAL will add a note to that effect on the website, so people wanting those reports will know they can download them from the website.

The WQ data is currently only in the SQL Database, which has been found to be very cumbersome to use for purposes of preparing reports. As new lab data is received from the laboratory it comes in an electronic form which can readily be electronically copied into the new Access Database. For WQ data that precedes the date upon which the laboratory began providing its data in electronic form, the PROFESSIONAL will perform programming work to transfer data from the SQL Database to the new Access Database.

The general layout of the WQ spreadsheet will be as follows:

Well No.	Date Sampled	Date Analyzed	Analytes				Comments	Max Contam. Level (MCL)
			Chloride	Sodium	pH	Nitrate		

The general layout of the WL spreadsheet will be as follows:

Well No.	Date	Elev. Of Ref. Point	Depth to Water	Static WL	Comments
----------	------	---------------------	----------------	-----------	----------

The PROFESSIONAL will provide draft versions of these spreadsheet layouts to the WATERMASTER for review and approval before populating them with data in the Database.

**C. Water Production Reports:** The PROFESSIONAL will create a Production Report will be included in the Access Database. The new Production Report will include the capability to readily prepare quarterly and annual production reports in the format currently in use by the WATERMASTER.

The PROFESSIONAL will populate the new Production Report with all data going back to the time that data began being reported to the Watermaster (2006). The PROFESSIONAL has all of that Production data in Excel form, so it can readily be used to populate the new Production Report that will be created in the Access Database. All of the pre-WATERMASTER detailed production data is only available in hard-copy form, but the PROFESSIONAL has annual summaries of that data in

electronic form (spreadsheets) dating back to 1987. The PROFESSIONAL will also put that annual summary production data into the Access Database for the years prior to the creation of the WATERMASTER.

Each quarter the PROFESSIONAL will place the Production Report on the WATERMASTER's website, at the same time that the Water Quality and Water Level reports are posted. The Production Reports will be posted only in Excel format.

## TASK 2. INPUTTING OF DATA

**A. Production Data:** To date WATERMASTER staff has been responsible to inputting Production Data. Under this RFS No. 2011-04 PROFESSIONAL will take on the responsibility of inputting production data into the Access Database, rather than having Watermaster staff do this. Getting the production data into the Access Database will be accomplished by having the WATERMASTER staff send PROFESSIONAL a copy of the quarterly or monthly production data reports that are received from the well-owners, so that PROFESSIONAL can input that data into the Access Database.

**B. Water Quality and Level Data:** Currently PROFESSIONAL's staff inputs all of the Water Quality and Water Level data, since part of its contract with the WATERMASTER calls for them to obtain that data. PROFESSIONAL's staff has also been inputting other data from time to time, such as the wellhead survey data that was performed in 2008, and specific information regarding wells and well owners.

## TASK 3. PROCESSING OF REQUESTS FOR DATA

The WATERMASTER will add a note to the Website saying:

*“The data on this website is updated quarterly. For more recent data a request should be submitted to the Watermaster by an email addressed to watermasterseaside@sbcglobal.net. The request should describe as clearly as possible the data that is being requested.”*

The WATERMASTER staff will be the email recipient of data requests from the general public and will review each request. If deemed appropriate the request will be forwarded to the person(s) designated by PROFESSIONAL for processing of such requests (initially these persons will be Joe Oliver and/or Jon Lear). If the request seeks information that is confidential and which is protected by the California Water Code, such as well logs and well location information, the requesting party will be notified of this by return email, and only the non-confidential portion of the data request will be responded to by PROFESSIONAL.

## TASK 4. ACCESS LEVELS AND PASSWORDS

Passwords are not currently required on the Website in order to access WQ, WL, or Production data. This will continue to be the case, so members of the general public who have an interest in this information will be able to access it just as they currently can. Current users at Access Levels 2 and 3 (TAC and Board members, PROFESSIONAL and WATERMASTER staff members who enter and manage data) will be able to access the data in the Access Database as follows:

- A. **Access Level 2 (TAC and Board members):** Access Level 2 users will be able to obtain any data in the Access Database that is not accessible on the WATERMASTER's website by submitting an email request to the designated PROFESSIONAL person(s) (initially Jon Lear), with cc to Laura Dadiw. No passwords will be needed. Requests will be processed in a timely manner.
- B. **Access Level 3 (PROFESSIONAL and WATERMASTER Staff who enter and manage data):** These users will have continuous access to the Database via remote access to the WATERMASTER's server where the Access Database will reside. This will be done using "LogMeIn" which is a free downloadable service that allows remote access to computers. All of these parties will have a common log-in password to get to the Server. Once there, they will each have a unique password to sign in to get access to the Access Database itself.
- C. **Access Level 4 (PROFESSIONAL and WATERMASTER Staff who administer Access Levels and Passwords):** Other than the consultants who have been working on the Database for the WATERMASTER, there are currently only two persons with Access Level 4, Joe Oliver and Bob Jaques. Dewey Evans will also be provided Access Level 4, so that these three persons will be able to regulate access to the Access Database in the same manner that access to the current on-line Database has been regulated. Much of the need for Passwords will no longer exist, but oversight as to what parties can directly access the Access Database for data input and management will still be needed.

## TASK 5. UNNEEDED REPORTS

The current on-line Database has several reports that have been found to be unnecessary. These are the "Compliance Report," the "Production Summary Report," and the "Contacts Report." These reports will not be carried over into the new Access Database.

## **ATTACHMENT 2**

### **COST DESCRIPTION**

The costs for the work of this RFS No. 2011-04 will be performed on a Time-and-Material basis. Hourly rates for these services will be charged at the individual hourly rates for the personnel involved in performing this work. These rates will be in the range of \$65 to \$100 per hour. To develop the Total Price of this RFS No. 2011-04, an assumed hourly rate of \$85 was used.

The attached spreadsheet details the estimated costs to perform the work of this RFS No. 2011-04.

Mileage will be charged at the IRS allowable rate. Any other direct costs will be charged at cost.

## Seaside Basin Watermaster Database RFS No. 2011-04

Task	Task Description	Hours	Rate (\$/hr)	Cost
1	Prepare Reports			
	A) Well Information Report	10	85	\$850
	B) Water Quality and Level Reports	15	85	\$1,275
	C) Water Production Reports	20	85	\$1,700
2	Inputting of Data			
	A) Production Data	10	85	\$850
	B) Water Quality Data	20	85	\$1,700
3	Processing of Requests for Data	0	85	\$0
4	Access Levels and Passwords	0	85	\$0
5	Unneeded Reports	0	85	\$0
<b>TOTALS:</b>		<b>75</b>		<b>\$6,375</b>

**ITEM NO. VIII.**

**OLD BUSINESS**



**SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN  
WATERMASTER**

**TO:** Board of Directors  
**FROM:** Dewey D Evans, CEO  
**DATE:** September 7, 2011

**SUBJECT:** Revise Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster Rules and Regulations Section 11.0 Reporting by Parties by adding language that would require the Parties to report the beginning and ending water meter readings

---

**PURPOSE:**

As stated in the Court Decision that created the Watermaster that governs the Seaside Groundwater Basin the Board of Directors were required to adopt a set of Rules and Regulations that will be used to carry out its duties, powers and responsibilities under the provisions of the the Court Decision. It was also stated in the Decision that the Rules and Regulations would be amended from time to time as it is deemed necessary.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Board consider approving a revision of the Watermaster's Rules and Regulations Section 11.0 second sentence by adding the following: "All Parties shall report their extraction quantities (and the corresponding beginning and ending water meter readings that were used to calculate these quantities,) to Watermaster for the preceding calendar quarter-----"

**DISCUSSION:**

At the May 4, 2011 Board meeting several revisions were approved by the Board members and have been incorporated into the attached document. One recommended revision was not approved due primarily to inadequate agenda notice for the affected water producers and the public to realize the effect of the recommended revision. This recommendation would add to the second sentence in Section 11.0 of the Watermaster Rules and Regulations the following "and the corresponding beginning and ending water meter readings that were used to calculate these quantities." This addition will allow the staff to verify the accuracy of the reported extraction quantities. If staff finds what appears to be a discrepancy between the meter readings and the quantities reported, staff can follow up on the discrepancy with the well owner to get it resolved.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

None

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- 1) RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN WATERMASTER--Revised

**RULES AND REGULATIONS**  
**OF THE**  
**SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN WATERMASTER**

1.0 Introduction

The Watermaster for the Seaside Basin was created on March 27, 2006 by entry of Judgment in *California American Water v. City of Seaside, et al.* (Case No. M66343, California Superior Court, Monterey County). A copy of the Judgment is appended to these Rules and Regulations. The purpose of the Watermaster is to assist the Court in the administration and enforcement of the provisions of the Judgment. All actions of the Watermaster shall be governed by the terms of the Judgment and these Rules and Regulations. In the event of any conflict between the terms of the Judgment and these Rules and Regulations, the Judgment, together with any further or supplemental orders or directions from the Court, shall control the actions of the Watermaster.

2.0 Definitions

Words and phrases which are defined in the Judgment shall have the same meaning when used in these Rules and Regulations. Other terms used in these Rules and Regulations shall have the meaning ascribed to them herein.

2.1 Parties

“**Parties**” shall mean and refer, individually and collectively, to California American Water Company (“**CalAm**”), the Public Agency Parties and the Landowner Group Parties. “**Public Agency Party**” shall mean and refer individually to the cities of Seaside, Sand City, Del Rey Oaks and Monterey, the County of Monterey, the Monterey County Water Resources Agency and the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District. “**Landowner Party**” shall mean and refer to a Producer in the Coastal Subarea and the Laguna Seca Subarea which is not a Public Agency Party or CalAm.

3.0 Watermaster Board

3.1 Representatives and Voting

The Watermaster may only act by and through the Watermaster Board. The Watermaster Board shall consist of nine (9) members (“**Members**”). Members shall be appointed by each of the following Parties or group of Parties in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 4 of these Rules and Regulations. A vote by a Member shall cast the following number of voting positions on the question presented to the Watermaster Board.

<u>Party/Group</u>	<u>Votes</u>
California American Water	3 votes
City of Seaside	2 votes
Monterey County Water Resources Agency	2 votes
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District	2 votes
City of Sand City	1 vote
City of Monterey	1 vote
City of Del Rey Oaks	1 vote
Landowner Parties Group (Coastal Subarea)	1/2 vote
Landowner Parties Group (Laguna Seca Subarea)	1/2 vote

### 3.1.1 Quorum

A minimum of six (6) Members shall be required to constitute a quorum of the Watermaster Board. No fewer than seven (7) affirmative votes shall be required for any action by the Watermaster. Any Member may request a roll call vote on any question or motion considered by the Watermaster Board, and the ayes and noes thereon shall be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

### 3.2 Organization of the Watermaster Board

At the first meeting of the Watermaster Board each year, the Watermaster Board shall elect a Chairperson, and a Vice Chairperson from its Membership. The Watermaster Board shall also select a Secretary, Treasurer and such assistant secretaries and assistant treasurer as may be appropriate. The Secretary, Treasurer, or any assistant or administrator appointed by the Watermaster Board need not be a Member.

### 3.3 Advisory Committees

The Watermaster Board may establish such committees and subcommittees as it deems necessary to advise Watermaster Board on specific issues. Persons appointed to such committees or subcommittees need not be a Member. The Watermaster Board shall appoint the Chairperson of any such committee or subcommittee. No more than five (5) Members or their Alternates shall sit on any individual committee or subcommittee. Each committee member shall be entitled to one (1) vote only.

#### 3.3.1 Standing Committees

The Watermaster Board has established the following standing committees.

##### A. Technical Advisory Committee

The purpose of the Technical Advisory Committee is to advise the Watermaster Board regarding implementation of the physical solution, and to perform

such specific tasks as the Watermaster assigns to the Technical Advisory Committee from time to time. The Technical Advisory Committee shall be made up of one committee member for each voting Member of the Board of Directors and one member of the Public duly voted on by the Board of Directors for a total of ten, (10) committee members. Committee members representing each Board voting member will be chosen by representatives from that Member entity. The individual voted on by the Board must reside within the boundaries of the Seaside Groundwater Basin and will serve for a two year term and could be reappointed if the Board so decides. At its sole discretion the Board may remove and/or replace the Public member at any time. A minimum of 6 members shall be required to constitute a quorum of the Technical Advisory Committee.

#### B. Budget and Finance Committee

The purpose of the Budget and Finance Committee is to advise the Watermaster Board regarding the funding of implementation of the physical solution, including operations of the Watermaster.

##### 3.3.2 Meetings of Standing Committees

Meetings of any standing committee may be called by the Chair or Vice Chair of such committee. At least 72 hours before a regular meeting of a standing committee or at least 24 hours before a special meeting of a standing committee, the Secretary of the Watermaster, or its designee, shall post an agenda containing a brief general description of each item of business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting and deliver a copy of the agenda to the members of the committee and to Persons who have made a written request for copies of the agendas of the standing committee. The agenda shall otherwise conform with the content, posting and availability of requirements for agencies set forth in Rule 3.6.

##### 3.4 Regular Meetings

Regular meetings of the Watermaster Board shall be held on the first Wednesday of each month. The meetings will be held at Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency, Monterey, California or another location set forth in the monthly meeting agenda and will begin at 2:00 p.m., unless a different time is set forth in the agenda.

##### 3.5 Special Meetings

###### 3.5.1 Special Meetings Called by Watermaster Board

A special meeting of the Watermaster Board may be called by the Watermaster Board at any regular or special meeting of the Watermaster Board.

###### 3.5.2 Special Meetings Called by Chair or Members

A special meeting of the Watermaster Board may be called at any time by the Chairperson or Vice Chairperson or by any three (3) Members, by written notice delivered personally or mailed to all Parties and Interested Persons, at least twenty-four (24) hours on a business day before the time of each such meeting in the case of personal delivery, and five (5) days' notice prior to such meeting in the case of mail if the special meeting is being called under urgent circumstances. If a special meeting is called by the Chairperson, Vice Chairperson or by any three (3) Members, and no urgent circumstance exists, then at least ten (10) days' notice must be provided to all Parties. The notice shall specify the time and place of the special meeting and the business to be transacted or discussed. No other business shall be considered at these meetings by the Watermaster Board. The written notice may be dispensed with as to any Member who at or prior to the time the special meeting convenes, files with the Secretary of the Watermaster Board a written waiver of notice. The written notice may also be dispensed with as to any Member who is actually present at the meeting at the time it convenes. The notice shall be posted at least seventy-two (72) hours prior to the special meeting in the posting locations referred to in section 3.6 of these Rules and Regulations.

### 3.6 Meeting Agendas

At least 72 hours before a regular meeting of the Watermaster Board, or at least 24 hours before a special meeting of the Watermaster Board, the Secretary of the Watermaster, or its designee, shall post an agenda containing a brief general description of each item of business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting, including items to be discussed in closed session, and deliver a copy of the agenda to the Members and to Persons who have made a written request to be added to the Watermaster's list of Interested Persons. A brief general description of an item generally need not exceed 20 words. The agenda shall specify the time and location of the regular or special meeting and shall be posted at the places which have been designated by the Public Agency Parties for the posting of official agendas in their respective jurisdictions. If requested, the agenda shall be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132), and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. The agenda shall include information regarding how, to whom, and when a request for disability related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services may be made by a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting.

### 3.7 Meeting Procedures

#### 3.7.1 Conduct for Meetings

Meetings of the Watermaster Board shall be called to order by the Chairperson or, in his or her absence, the Vice Chairperson. Watermaster Board meetings shall be conducted in conformity with the procedures established for meetings of public agencies pursuant to the California Open Meeting Law (the "**Brown Act**"),

California Government Code section 54950 et seq., as it may be amended from time to time.

### 3.7.2 Minutes

The Secretary shall keep accurate minutes of all meetings of the Watermaster Board which reflect all actions taken by the Watermaster. Copies thereof shall be furnished to all Members and Interested Persons. Copies of minutes shall constitute notice of any Watermaster Board action therein reported.

### 3.7.3 Closed Session

The Watermaster Board may convene closed session meetings in accordance with Brown Act procedures.

## 4.0 Members

### 4.1 Appointment of Members

The Public Agency Parties, groups of Landowner Parties identified in section 3.1 and CalAm have each appointed an initial Member to sit on the Watermaster Board for a two (2) year term ending at the first regular meeting of the Watermaster in January of 2008. The Public Agency Parties, groups of Landowner Parties and CalAm shall each appoint or reappoint one Member in November of every second year, beginning in November of 2007, to sit on the Watermaster Board for a two (2) year term. Except for the initial Members, each Member shall assume office at the first regular meeting of the Watermaster Board held in January of every second year, beginning in January of 2008. The Secretary shall give notice of this requirement to each of the Parties during the October preceding each such January.

### 4.2 Alternate Members

In addition to appointing a Member, CalAm and the Public Agency Parties may also appoint an alternate Member in the same manner and for the same terms as provided for Members in these Rules and Regulations. Each Member representing a group of Landowner Parties may act as an alternate for the Member representing the other group of Landowner Parties. A duly appointed Alternate Member may exercise all of the rights of a Member at a meeting of the Watermaster Board where the Member for whom the Alternate Member sits, is absent.

### 4.3 Appointments

Appointments of Members and Alternate Members, if any, shall be made in a writing signed on behalf of the Party or group of Parties identified in section 3.1 which is delivered to the Secretary no later than the close of public comment for the agenda item regarding announcement of appointment of new Members at the November meeting. The

Watermaster Board shall give notice to the Court of any person appointed as a Member or Alternate Member.

#### 4.4 Vacancies

Should a Member or Alternate Member resign or otherwise be unable to complete his or her term on the Watermaster Board, the Party or group of Parties which appointed such Member shall appoint a new Member to complete the unexpired term, and deliver notice of that appointment to the Secretary.

#### 4.5 Special Rules for Appointment of Members by Landowner Groups

Appointment of Members by the Landowner Parties shall take place at each November meeting of the Watermaster Board (except for the appointment of initial Members) where the appointment of new Members is to be announced. Each Landowner Party will vote for their preferred Member in writing, signed by an agent of the Landowner Party and delivered to the Watermaster Board no later than the close of public comment for the agenda item regarding election of the Landowner Group Members. Voting rights may only be transferred upon permanent sale of 51% or more of the Landowner's respective Production Allocation. Landowner Parties may only vote for the representative for their respective subarea (i.e., Coastal Subarea Landowner Group Parties vote for the Coastal Subarea Member; and Laguna Seca Landowner Group Parties vote for the Laguna Seca Subarea Member). Should a Member appointed by a Landowner Group be unable to complete his or her term on the Watermaster Board, the Landowner Group which appointed such Member shall give notice to the Secretary who shall schedule an election at the next meeting of the Watermaster Board for the replacement of that Member to be held in the same manner as regular appointments of Landowner Group Members. Landowner Group Members are elected by cumulative voting, with each member of the Landowner Group entitled to one vote for each acre-foot of Production Allocation established in the Judgment.

#### 4.6 Compensation

No Member shall be compensated by the Watermaster for their service on the Watermaster Board.

#### 5.0 Administration

##### 5.1 Watermaster Office

The Watermaster office shall be located at 2600 Garden Road, Suite 228, Monterey, CA 93940. The Watermaster Board may change the location of the Watermaster office from time to time to a place located in Monterey County.

##### 5.2 Records

The minutes of Watermaster Board meetings shall be open to inspection and maintained at the Watermaster office. Copies of minutes and other Watermaster records may be obtained for inspection in accordance with the procedures set forth in the California Public Records Act. Copies of records may be obtained upon payment of the actual cost of duplication established by the Watermaster.

### 5.3 Notice Lists

The Watermaster shall maintain at all times a current list of the Parties to whom notices are to be sent and their addresses for purposes of service. The Watermaster shall also maintain a list of interested Persons (“**Interested Persons**”) that shall include all Persons who have made a written request to the Watermaster to be included on the list of Interested Persons. All notices, determinations, requests, demands, objections, reports and other papers and processes required to be delivered to Interested Persons under the Judgment, these Rules and Regulations or by Order of the Watermaster, shall be delivered to all Parties and Interested Persons.

### 6.0 Budget

The Watermaster Board will annually adopt a budget for each Fiscal Year stating the anticipated annual expenses required for implementation of the Judgment, including reasonable reserve funds. Each annual budget will contain at least three (3) separate components: (1) an Administrative Budget; (2) a Monitoring and Planning Budget; and, (3) a Replenishment Budget. Seven (7) affirmative votes shall be required for the adoption of any budget or budget assessment by the Watermaster Board. No Member representing a Landowner Party may participate in any vote concerning the approval of the Administrative Budget or Mitigation and Monitoring Plan Budget or the amount of any assessment levied by the Watermaster Board to fund those budgets.

#### 6.1 Adoption of Budget and Budget Assessments

No later than October of 2006, and no later than October of each year thereafter, the Watermaster Board shall adopt a tentative budget, including assessments, for the ensuing Fiscal Year. The tentative budget will be mailed by the Secretary to each Party no earlier than November 1 and no later than November 15 before the beginning of the next Fiscal Year.

##### 6.1.1 Objections

Objections to the tentative budget by any Producer must be submitted in writing to the Watermaster Board within fifteen (15) days after the date of mailing of the tentative budget. If no timely objections are received, the tentative budget shall become the final budget. If objections are received, the Watermaster Board shall consider the objections within ten (10) days thereafter and shall prepare a final budget. The final budget will be thereafter mailed to each Producer together with a statement of the amount assessed to each Producer.



### 6.1.2 Appeal to Court

Any Producer may apply to the Court within fifteen (15) days after the mailing of the final budget for revision based on specific objections. Payments of assessments otherwise required shall be made despite the filing of a request for revision with the Court. Upon any revision by the Court, the Watermaster shall either remit to the Producers their pro rata portions of any reduction in the budget, or credit their accounts with respect to any assessment for the next ensuing Administrative Year as the Court shall direct.

## 6.2 Payment of Assessments

All amounts assessed by the Watermaster Board in the final budget shall be paid to the Watermaster by the Party assessed no later than January 15<sup>th</sup> of the Fiscal Year to which the assessment relates. If such payment by any Producer is not timely made, the Watermaster shall add a penalty of five percent (5%) thereof to the amount assessed against such Producer.

### 6.2.1 Contributions to Budget

The Watermaster Board may accept contributions of money, goods or services in furtherance of its purposes.

## 6.3 Administrative Budget

The Watermaster Board shall adopt an Administrative Budget for each Fiscal Year in an amount sufficient to fund the costs associated with the administration of the Watermaster. The Administrative Budget for the first Fiscal Year shall not exceed ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$100,000). The first ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$100,000) of the Administrative Budget shall be assessed against California American Water Company, City of Seaside and City of Sand City in the following percentage shares:

California American Water	83%
City of Seaside	14.4%
City of Sand City	2.6%

## 6.4 Monitoring and Management Program Budget

The Watermaster Board shall develop a budget called the “**Monitoring and Management: Operations Fund,**” in an amount sufficient to fund the cost of the Monitoring and Management Plan referred to in section 7. The Monitoring and Management: Operations Fund Budget for the first Fiscal Year shall not exceed TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$200,000). The Watermaster Board shall also

levy a one time assessment of the “**Monitoring and Management: Capital Fund**” in an amount sufficient to fund the cost of the capital improvements described in the Monitoring and Management Program, including but not limited to (1) installation of water quality and water level monitoring wells; (2) implementation of piezometric and water quality monitoring program; (3) installation of sentinel wells to detect seawater intrusion into on-shore portions of the Basin; (4) exploratory borehole drilling, geophysical surveys and improved estimates of natural and secondary recharge in the Basin related to the development of a groundwater model. The total amount of the one time Monitoring and Management: Capital Fund Budget Assessment shall not exceed ONE MILLION DOLLARS (\$1,000,000). The total amount of both the Monitoring and Management: Operations Budget and the Monitoring and Management: Capital Fund Budget Assessments shall be assessed against the Standard Producers in the Coastal Subarea in the following shares:

California American Water	91%
City of Seaside	7%
Granite Rock	1%
D.B.O. Development No. 27	1%

At such time as a Party within the Coastal Subarea chooses to change its Alternative Production to a Standard Production Allocation, that Party will be assessed a proportionate share of the Monitoring and Management Plan Budget.

#### 6.5 Replenishment Budget

As a part of its annual budget process, the Watermaster Board shall declare the per-acre-foot cost of the Replenishment Assessments in October of each Water Year. The per-acre foot cost of Replenishment Assessments for Production in excess of Natural Safe Yield shall be based on the anticipated cost of Artificial Replenishment, including the cost to construct, operate, and maintain facilities necessary for replenishment of the Basin. Replenishment Assessments may only be used for Artificial Replenishment.

##### 6.5.1 Assessment on Production Over Natural Safe-Yield

At the end of each Water Year the Watermaster shall levy an Over-Production Replenishment Assessment for Production by any Party over the Natural Safe-Yield of the Seaside Basin. The Over-Production Replenishment Assessment does not apply to Production under an Alternative Production Allocation so long as such Production is within the fixed amount established for that Alternate Producer in Table 2 of Section III.B.3 of the Judgment. The Watermaster will determine each Producer’s Over-Production Replenishment Assessment, if any, by using the following method:

6.5.1.1 For purposes of determining the Over-Production Replenishment Assessment each Standard Producer is entitled to the following percentage share of Natural Safe Yield and/or the Operating Yield that is in excess of production by those Parties with an Alternative Production Allocation:

California American Water	91.38 %
City of Seaside	6.81%
Granite Rock	.64%
D.B.O. Development	1.16%

6.5.1.2 These percentages were determined by first multiplying the Coastal Subarea Standard Production Allocations by that portion of the Operating Yield for the Coastal Subarea which is in excess of the sum of the Alternative Production Allocations within the Coastal Subarea. (The Standard Production Allocations do not total 100 percent. Thus, after the initial calculation, the Standard Production Allocation must continue to be applied to the remainder until less than one acre-foot remains.) Second, California American’s Laguna Seca Subarea Allocation (no other standard producer has a Laguna Seca allocation) must be added to California American’s total allocation and each Standard Producer’s percentage share of the Operating Yield must be recalculated.

6.5.1.3 If any Standard Producer produces more than the amount of water determined by applying its percentage to the Natural Safe Yield, then Watermaster shall assess a Replenishment Assessment for that Standard Producer. The amount of the Replenishment Assessment will be determined by multiplying the Replenishment Assessment per-acre-foot cost by the number of acre-feet pumped in excess of that Standard Producer’s allocation of the Natural Safe Yield.

6.5.1.4 At such time as a Party chooses to change its Alternative Production to a Standard Production Allocation, the percentage shares shall be redetermined.

6.5.2 Assessment on Production Over Operating Safe Yield

The Watermaster Board shall levy an additional Replenishment Assessment on any Alternative Producer for each acre-foot of water produced over their respective Alternative Allocation, and on any Standard Producer for each acre-foot produced over their respective percentage share of the Operating Safe Yield. Should the Watermaster be unable to procure replenishment water to offset Production over the Operating Safe Yield in the previous Water Year, the Watermaster will prohibit any Production over the Operating Safe Yield in the current year or until such time as replenishment water is provided.

6.5.3 Payment of Replenishment Assessment

At the end of each Water Year, the Watermaster will promptly notify each Producer by mail of any Replenishment Assessment owed. Payment must be made by January 15<sup>th</sup> of the following year. If such payment by any Producer is not timely made,

the Watermaster shall add a penalty of five percent (5%) thereof to the amount assessed against such Producer.

#### 6.5.4 California American Credit Toward Replenishment Assessment

California American's expenditures for water supply augmentation may also provide replenishment water for the Seaside Basin. Accordingly, on an annual basis, California American will provide the Watermaster Board with an accounting of all expenditures it has made for water supply augmentation that it contends has or will result in replenishment of the Basin. The Watermaster Board shall review these expenditures and if it concurs, reduce California American's Replenishment Assessment obligation, for that year, by an amount equal to the amount claimed by California American. To the extent that the Watermaster Board rejects any of the claimed amounts, it shall provide California American with an explanation for the rejection and allow California American an opportunity to meet and confer on the disputed amount. In the event that the Watermaster Board and California American cannot agree, the matter may be referred to the Court through a request filed by California American.

#### 7.0 Monitoring and Management Program

Within sixty (60) days of entry of Judgment, the Watermaster Board shall approve the Seaside Groundwater Basin Monitoring and Management Program. The Monitoring and Management Program shall conform to the criteria set forth in Exhibit A to the Judgment, and shall include but not be limited to a seawater intrusion contingency plan, criteria for the annual collection and analysis of groundwater production and quality data, land use data, and the development of criteria for modification of the Operating Safe Yield. The Monitoring and Management Program shall also include criteria to determine the Total Useable Storage Space in the Basin. The Watermaster Board may amend the Monitoring and Management Program from time to time.

#### 8.0 Operating Yield and Material Injury

Pursuant to the Judgment, the Watermaster must continually monitor for Material Injury to the Seaside Basin. If the Watermaster Board determines that groundwater extractions at the Operating Yield are resulting in Material Injury, the Watermaster Board will immediately present the Court with a report detailing the circumstances constituting such Material Injury and, if Watermaster deems appropriate, a recommendation for a reduction in the Operating Yield to respond to the perceived material Injury. In the event that the Court concurs in the Watermaster's conclusion of Material Injury, the Watermaster Board shall determine a lower Operating Yield in accordance with the Principles and Procedures attached as Exhibit A to the Judgment, and through the application of criteria that it shall develop for this purpose.

#### 9.0 Procedures For Assignment and Transfer of Production Allocations

Parties proposing to assign or transfer any portion of their Production Allocation must submit a written notice to the Watermaster forty-five (45) days prior to the effective date of the proposed assignment or transfer. The notice shall include all details of the assignment/transfer (other than details related to consideration for such assignment or transfer), including thorough descriptions of: (1) the Production Allocation being assigned/transferred; (2) the assignor/assignee or transferor/transferee; (3) the duration of assignment/transfer; and (4) the quantity of Production Allocation being assigned/transferred. The Secretary shall transmit a copy of the notice to each of the Members. Within twenty-one (21) days of the mailing of the notice from the Secretary, any Member may file an objection to the proposed assignment/transfer with the Secretary. If no objection is received within that time, the proposed assignment/transfer shall become effective in accordance with its terms. If an objection is received within that time, the Secretary shall cause the matter to be placed on the agenda for the next available meeting of the Watermaster Board. At the meeting, the Member who filed the objection will carry the burden of proving to the Watermaster Board, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the production contemplated by the assignment/transfer will significantly increase the risk of Material Injury to the Basin above the risk posed by production absent the assignment/transfer. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Watermaster Board shall make its determination regarding any increased risk of Material Injury. If the Watermaster Board determines that the proposed assignment/transfer will not significantly increase risk of Material Injury, the proposed the assignment/transfer shall thereupon become effective. If the Watermaster Board determines, based on its detailed written findings, that the proposed assignment/transfer will result in significant increase of risk of Material Injury, the Watermaster may impose such conditions on the proposed assignment/transfer as it deems necessary to reduce such risk.

#### 10.0 Storage

Prior to the beginning of the next Administrative Year, the Watermaster Board shall declare the next year's Total Useable Storage Space for the Seaside Basin. The Watermaster Board may periodically amend the quantity of Total Useable Storage Space throughout the year based upon criteria set forth in the Seaside Groundwater Basin Monitoring and Management Plan. Parties seeking to store water in the Seaside Basin shall follow the procedures set forth in the Judgment.

#### 11.0 Reporting by Parties

Pursuant to the terms of the Judgment, all Parties are required to install, at their own cost, devices to measure the quantity of water they extract from the Seaside Basin. All Parties shall report their extraction quantities-, and the corresponding beginning and ending water meter readings that were used to calculate these quantities, to Watermaster for the preceding calendar quarter, in writing, on January 15, April 15 and July 15 and October 15 of each Water Year. The water measuring devices must meet the following standards, which are also requirements of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District:

11.1 A minimum of eight diameters of straight pipe upstream and downstream of the centerline of the meter (i.e., no bends or valves) must be provided to limit turbulence at the meter. Exceptions can be made if it can be demonstrated that the meter is installed according to the manufacturer's recommendations for straight unobstructed flow lengths upstream and downstream of the meter.

11.2 The meter installation must be configured to provide a full flow of water in the pipe at the meter under all flow conditions.

11.3 The meter must be situated such that all water produced from the well is measured.

11.4 Following installation, the meter must be maintained to an accuracy of plus or minus five percent ( $\pm 5\%$ ) of true flow.

11.5 The meter must be equipped with a totalizer that is susceptible to correction only by changing mechanical gear equipment.

11.6 The water meter should be installed in accordance with good design practices and sufficient space should be provided to allow access for inspections and testing as may, from time to time, be deemed necessary.

11.7 The specified flow range of the meter should be consistent with the range of flows provided from the well.

11.8 If solid material (e.g., silt, sand, rust particles, etc.) is present in the discharge from the well, a strainer or filter should be installed in the pipe upstream of the meter to avoid fouling of the meter.

11.9 The well discharge piping, valves, connections, and meter should be water tight. "Wet dial face" meters should be avoided. These meters tend to become unreadable over time, requiring maintenance that could be avoided with the installation of a meter that precludes entry of discharge water into the dial compartment (i.e., a "dry dial face").

11.10 The meter and discharge line should be protected from freezing, where possible, by installing the meter underground, below the frost line, wrapped in insulation, or otherwise enclosing the meter in an insulated box.

11.11 Appropriate fittings should be used to allow easy installation and maintenance of the meter.

11.12 The water meter should be installed by a qualified, experienced professional.

11.13 Manufacturers of water meters that are satisfactory to the Watermaster include, but are not limited to:

- McCrometer Water Meters
- Invensys Meters, Inc.
- Sparling Instruments, Inc.
- Badger Meter
- Water Specialties Corporation

## 12.0 Notice

All notices, determinations, requests, and reports required to be delivered to interested persons shall be delivered to all Parties and all persons on Watermaster's list of Interested Persons. Delivery or service of any notice of document required to be served upon or delivered shall be deemed made by deposit in the mail, first class postage prepaid, addressed as shown on the Watermaster's list of Parties or Interested Persons, or by alternative means of delivery (such as email or facsimile) agreed to in advance by a Party or Interested Party. Any Party or Interested Person desiring to be relieved of receiving deliveries from Watermaster may file, in writing, a waiver.

## 13.0 Watermaster Annual Report

The Watermaster will prepare and file with the Court, and mail to each of the Parties on or before December 15th of each Water Year, an annual report for the preceding Administrative Year. The Watermaster's annual report shall address the following matters, in addition to other matters deemed appropriate by the Watermaster or requested by the Court: (1) groundwater extractions; (2) groundwater storage; (3) amount of artificial replenishment, if any, performed by the Watermaster; (4) leases or sales of Production Allocations; (5) use of imported, reclaimed, or desalinated water as a source of water for storage or as a water supply for lands overlying the Seaside Basin; (6) violations of the Judgment or the Rules and Regulations of the Watermaster, and any corrective action taken; (7) Watermaster administration costs; (8) the fixed per acre fee for replenishment assessments, and the amount of replenishment assessments levied and paid; (9) all components of the Watermaster budget; and, (10) recommendations.

## 14.0 Compliance With Judgment and Rules and Regulations

The Watermaster Board will promptly review the written request for compliance with all terms of the Judgment and these Rules and Regulations, and the Watermaster Board will promptly place the matter on a regular meeting agenda for consideration and action by the Watermaster Board.

## 15.0 Computation of Time

The time in which any act provided by the Judgment or these Rules and Regulations shall be computed by excluding the first day and including the last, unless

the last is a holiday. Holidays are every Sunday and any other days that are specified or provided as holidays in Government Code sec. 6700.

#### 16.0 Review of Watermaster Decisions

Any action, decision, rule or procedure of the Watermaster shall be subject to review by the Court on motion filed by any Party in accordance with the following procedure.

##### 16.1 Effective Date of Watermaster Action

Any order, decision or action of the Watermaster on a noticed specific agenda item shall be deemed to have occurred on the date of the order, decision or action.

##### 16.2 Notice of Motion

Any Party, by a regularly noticed motion, may petition the Court for review of the Watermaster's action or decision. The motion shall be deemed filed when a copy, conformed as filed with the Court, has been delivered to the Watermaster with the service fee established by the Watermaster. The fee shall be sufficient to cover the cost of photocopying and mailing the motion to each Party. The Watermaster shall prepare copies and mail a copy to each Party on the Watermaster's list of Parties.

##### 16.3 Time for Motion

A motion to review any Watermaster action or decision shall be filed within thirty (30) days after such Watermaster action or decision, except that motions to review Budget Assessments and Replenishment Assessments shall be filed within fifteen (15) days of mailing a notice of assessment.



**ITEM. IX.**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**ITEM IX. A.**

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**ITEM NO. IX.A.1.**

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE  
(TAC)**

9/7/11

**SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN  
WATERMASTER**

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Robert S. Jaques, Technical Program Manager  
MODIFIED AND APPROVED BY: Dewey D Evans, CEO

DATE: September 7, 2011

SUBJECT: Consider Approval of Storage and Recovery Agreement with California American Water

-----  
**RECOMMENDATION**

Consider approving the attached Storage and Recovery Agreement with CAW.

**BACKGROUND:**

The Amended Decision of the Court which created the Watermaster calls for the Watermaster to formally declare what the Total Usable Storage Space in the Seaside Groundwater Basin (“Basin”) is, and also how that storage space is to be allocated to the producers. At its January 25, 2010 meeting the Board issued a Declaration of the Total Usable Storage Space of the Basin, and also allocated this Storage Space amongst the Standard Producers. Pursuant to the Amended Decision, Alternative Producers do not receive a storage allocation, only Standard Producers receive such an allocation.

The Amended Decision requires that any Standard Producer that wishes to store and recover water from the Seaside Basin must first receive approval by the Watermaster to do so. In anticipation that some Standard Producers may wish to use their storage allocations for this purpose, the Board at its June 2, 2010 meeting approved an application template and a storage agreement template for granting approval to store and recover water. Drafts of these documents were provided to the TAC in January 2010 for its review and editing before they were sent out to all Producers, both Standard and Alternative, for further review and editing before they were approved by the Board.

**DISCUSSION**

Using the Board-approved template, California American Water (CAW) submitted an application to store and recover non-native water from the Seaside Groundwater Basin. Based on the information contained in that application, supplemented with information from MPWMD, the SWRCB, and the RWQCB, the attached storage and recovery Agreement was prepared using the Board-approved template. The TAC reviewed the proposed Agreement at its August 10, 2011 meeting, found it to be satisfactory, and recommends to the Board that the Agreement be approved.

If approved, the Agreement would authorize CAW to store and recover up to 2,426 AFY of water from the Carmel River in the Seaside Basin, using the ASR injection wells constructed by MPWMD for storing the water, and CAW’s existing production wells and/or the ASR wells to recover that water.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Agreement for Storage and Recovery of Non-Native Water from the Seaside Groundwater Basin

**AGREEMENT FOR STORAGE AND RECOVERY  
OF  
NON-NATIVE WATER  
FROM THE  
SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN**

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into on \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, by and between the SEASIDE BASIN WATERMASTER (the "WATERMASTER"), and California American Water, (the "PRODUCER"), as follows:

Recitals

1. The WATERMASTER was created by the Amended Decision of the Monterey County Superior Court, filed February 9, 2007, Case No. M66343 (the "Decision"). This Decision was made for the purposes of managing and protecting the Seaside Groundwater Basin ("Basin") for the benefit of the businesses, individuals, and public agencies that overlie or extract groundwater from the Basin.
2. The PRODUCER has applied to the WATERMASTER for permission to store Non-Native water in, and to subsequently recover that stored water from, the Basin.
3. Under the authorities granted to the WATERMASTER by the Decision, the WATERMASTER has approved PRODUCER's application and hereby grants permission to the PRODUCER to store Non-Native water in, and to recover that stored water from, the Basin, subject to the Terms and Conditions contained in this Agreement.

Terms and Conditions

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing and the mutual promises contained herein, the parties hereto agree to the following terms and conditions:

1. Definitions. Unless otherwise specifically defined herein, the defined terms shall be given the same definition and meaning set forth in the Decision, as listed in Attachment A.
2. Storage Quantity. The PRODUCER is authorized to store by means of direct injection 2,426 acre-feet per year of Non-Native Water in the Basin. In the event the WATERMASTER revises the Total Usable Storage Space of the Basin in accordance with Section III.H.4 of the Decision, or if one or more Alternative Producers converts entirely or in part from an Alternative Production Allocation to a Standard Production Allocation in accordance with Section III.B.3.e of the Decision, the PRODUCER's Storage Allocation may change, and this may affect the storage quantity authorized by this Agreement. In such instance this Agreement will be modified to reflect these changes.
3. Storage Location(s). The storage of water authorized under paragraph 2 above will be performed at the following location(s):

- A. ASR-1 injection and recovery well located at the Santa Margarita ASR site located at 1910 General Jim Moore Blvd, Seaside, CA 93955.
- B. ASR-2 injection and recovery well located at the Santa Margarita ASR site located at 1910 General Jim Moore Blvd, Seaside, CA 93955.

Also located at the Santa Margarita ASR site is a well blow off pit that normally receives ASR water during injection periods to flush the well injection screens to maximize ASR injection rate.

- 4. Recovery Location(s). Recovery of water stored at the location(s) described under paragraph 3 above must be performed within the same Subarea of the Basin as the location(s) within which it was stored. Recovery of this water will be performed at some or all of the following location(s):
  - A. Santa Margarita Well #1, 1910 General Jim Moore Blvd, Seaside CA 93955 (Santa Margarita)
  - B. Santa Margarita Well #2, 1910 General Jim Moore Blvd, Seaside CA 93955 (Santa Margarita)
  - C. Ord Grove Well #2, 1987 Park Ct., Seaside CA 93955 (Santa Margarita)
  - D. Paralta Well, 2104 Paralta Ave., Seaside CA 93955 (Santa Margarita)
  - E. Luzern Well #2, 1984 Luzern St., Seaside CA 93955 (Paso Robles)
  - F. Playa Well #3, 1237 Playa Ave., Seaside CA 93955 (Paso Robles)
  - G. Plumas Well #4, 1453 Plumas Ln., Seaside CA 93955 (Paso Robles)
- 5. Recovery Quantity. The PRODUCER is initially authorized to recover (Extract) the full amount of the water actually Stored in accordance with this Agreement. However, due to the hydrogeologic characteristics of the Seaside Basin, naturally occurring losses of Stored Water may result in the WATERMASTER reducing the percentage of Stored Water that may be Extracted. Should the WATERMASTER determine that this needs to be done, this Agreement will be modified to reflect the reduced quantity of water that the PRODUCER may recover, and the technical basis for this determination will be provided to all PRODUCERS.
- 6. Water Quality. The PRODUCER hereby certifies that prior to the Non-Native water being introduced into the Basin for Storage in accordance with this Agreement, all such water will meet all of the requirements imposed on the PRODUCER by permits and/or approvals issued to the PRODUCER by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board and any other water quality standards imposed by any other government entity, including without limitation the California Department of Public Health and the Monterey County Department of Environmental Health.

The representative water quality characteristics of the water that will be stored under this Agreement are contained in Attachment B, and are considered by both parties to this Agreement to not pose a threat of harm to the Basin.

- 7. Carryover of Unused Production Allocation and Carryover Credits. In accordance with Section III.F of the Decision, if during a particular Water Year the PRODUCER does not Extract from the Basin a total quantity equal to the PRODUCER's Standard Production Allocation for the particular Water Year, the PRODUCER may establish Carryover Credits, up to the total amount of the PRODUCER's Storage Allocation.

However, in accordance with the Decision in no circumstance may the sum of the PRODUCER's Stored Water Credits and Carryover Credits exceed the PRODUCER's available Storage Allocation. In accordance with the Decision in consideration of the Seaside Basin's hydrogeologic characteristics, the WATERMASTER may reduce the quantity of Water that may be Extracted pursuant to a Carryover Credit.

In accordance with Section III.H.5 of the Decision, the PRODUCER has the right to use its Storage Allocation to Store any Carryover Water subject to the provisions of the Decision and this Agreement. In accordance with the Decision unused (not Extracted) Stored Water Credits and Carryover Credits may be carried over from year to year, but the amount that may be carried over in any year is subject to a percentage decrease, if a decrease in the Basin's Operating Yield is declared by the WATERMASTER in accordance with Section III.B.2 of the Decision.

8. Measurement and Reporting of Extractions and Storage. In accordance with Section III.J of the Decision, the PRODUCER shall install, maintain, and use adequate measuring devices on all Storage and Extraction facilities as required by the WATERMASTER's Rules and Regulations and this Agreement.

The PRODUCER shall provide to the WATERMASTER, as part of each monthly Production Report, data for the reporting period stating:

- The quantity of water that was stored
- The quantity of stored water that was recovered (Extracted)
- The location(s) where the water was stored
- The location(s) where the water was recovered (Extracted)

9. Indemnification. The PRODUCER shall assume the defense of, indemnify and hold harmless, the WATERMASTER, its officers, agents and employees from all claims, liability, loss, damage or injury of any kind, nature or description arising directly or indirectly from actions or omissions by PRODUCER or any of its officers, agents, employees, or independent contractors relating to this Agreement, , excepting claims, liability, loss, damage or injury which arise from the willful or negligent acts, omissions, or activities of an officer, agent or employee of the WATERMASTER.

10. Successors and Assigns. This Agreement, and all the terms and conditions hereof, shall apply to and bind the successors and assigns of the respective parties hereto; provided that the PRODUCER shall not assign this Agreement without prior written consent of the WATERMASTER.

11. Further Cooperation. Each of the parties agree to reasonably cooperate with each other, and to execute and deliver to the other all such documents and instruments, and to take such further actions, as may reasonably be required to give effect to the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

12. Interpretation. It is agreed and understood by the parties hereto that this Agreement has been arrived at through negotiation and that neither party is to be deemed the party which prepared this Agreement within the meaning of Civil Code §1654. The provisions of this Agreement shall be interpreted in a reasonable manner to effect the purpose of the parties and this Agreement.

13. Disputes. If any dispute under this Agreement arises the parties shall first meet and confer in a good faith attempt to resolve the matter between themselves. Each party shall make all reasonable efforts to provide to the other party all the information that the party has in its possession that is relevant to the dispute, so that both parties will have ample information with which to reach a decision. If the dispute is not resolved by meeting and conferring, the matter shall be submitted to the Court for resolution pursuant to the Court's reserved jurisdiction as set forth in the Decision.
14. Modification. This Agreement may be amended, altered or modified only by a writing, specifying such amendment, alteration or modification, executed by authorized representatives of both of the parties hereto.
15. Attorney's Fees and Costs. In the event it should become necessary for either party to enforce any of the terms and conditions of this Agreement by means of court action or administrative enforcement, the prevailing party, in addition to any other remedy at law or in equity available to such party, shall be awarded all reasonable costs and reasonable attorney's fees in connection therewith, including the fees and costs of experts reasonably consulted by the attorneys for the prevailing party.
16. Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in two counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but both of which shall be deemed to constitute one and the same instrument.
17. Written Notice. Written notice shall be deemed to have been duly served if delivered in person or by mail to the individuals and at the addresses listed below:



A. WATERMASTER: Chief Executive Officer  
Seaside Basin Watermaster  
2600 Garden Road, Suite 228  
Monterey, CA 93940

B. PRODUCER: Craig E. Anthony, General Manager  
California American Water  
511 Forest Lodge Road, Suite 100  
Pacific Grove. CA 93950

18. Conflicts with the Decision. The PRODUCER's rights under this Agreement are subject to the Decision and in the event of any conflict between the provisions of this Agreement and the Decision, the Decision shall control.

19. Entire Agreement. This Agreement constitutes the entire and complete agreement between the parties regarding the subject matter hereof, and supersedes all prior or contemporaneous negotiations, understandings or agreements of the parties, whether written or oral, with respect to such subject matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have executed this Agreement consisting of five (5) pages and two (2) attachments in duplicate on the date hereinabove written.

WATERMASTER

PRODUCER

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Dewey Evans  
Chief Executive Officer

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Craig E. Anthony  
General Manager

**ATTACHMENT A**

**DEFINITIONS**  
**(Excerpted from the Decision)**

"Artificial Replenishment" means the act of the WATERMASTER, directly or indirectly, engaging in or contracting for Non-Native Water to be added to the Groundwater supply of the Seaside Basin through Spreading or Direct Injection to offset the cumulative Over- Production from the Seaside Basin in any particular Water Year pursuant to Section III.L.3.j.iii. It shall also include programs in which Producers agree to refrain, in whole or in part, from exercising their right to produce their full Production Allocation where the intent is to cause the replenishment of the Seaside Basin through forbearance in lieu of the injection or spreading of Non-Native Water.

"Carryover" means that portion of a Party's Production Allocation that is not Extracted from the Basin during a particular Water Year. Each acre-foot of Carryover establishes an acre-foot of Carryover Credit.

"Carryover Credit(s)" means the quantity of Water established through Carryover, that a Party is entitled to Produce from the Basin pursuant to Section III.F.

"Extraction," "Extractions," "Extracting," "Extracted," and other variations of the same noun or verb, mean pumping, taking, diverting or withdrawing Groundwater by any manner or means whatsoever from the Seaside Basin.

"Groundwater" means all Water beneath the ground surface in the Seaside Basin, including Water from Natural Replenishment, Artificial Replenishment, Carryover, and Stored Water.

"Natural Replenishment" means all processes by which Water may become a part of the Groundwater supply of the Seaside Basin without the benefit of the Physical Solution and the coordinated management it provides. Groundwater that occurs in the Seaside Basin as a result of the Physical Solution, which is not Natural Replenishment, includes, but is not limited to Storage, Carryover, and Artificial Replenishment.

"Non-Native Water" means all Water that would not otherwise add to the Groundwater supply through natural means or from return flows from surface applications other than intentional Spreading.

"Physical Solution" means the efficient and equitable management of Groundwater resources within the Seaside Basin, as prescribed by this Decision, to maximize the reasonable and beneficial use of Water resources in a manner that is consistent with Article X, Section 2 of the California Constitution, the public interest, and the basin rights of the Parties, while working to bring the Production of Native Water to Natural Safe Yield.

"Producer" means a Party possessing a Base Water Rights.

"Standard Production Allocation" is the amount of Groundwater that a Producer participating in this allocation method may Produce from a Subarea of the Seaside Basin as provided in Section III.B.2, which is determined by multiplying the Base Water Right by the Operating Yield.

"Storage" means the existence of Stored Water in the Seaside Basin.

"Storage Allocation" means that quantity of Stored Water in acre feet that a Party is allowed to Store in the Coastal Subarea or the Laguna Seca Subarea at any particular time.

"Storage Allocation Percentage" means the percentage of Total Usable Storage Space allocated to each Producer proceeding under the Standard Production Allocation. Producers proceeding under the Alternative Production Allocation are not allocated Storage rights and, consequently, their share of the Total Usable Storage Space is apportioned to the Producers proceeding under the Standard Production Allocation. Pursuant to the terms of Section III.B.3, Parties proceeding under the Alternative Production Allocation enjoy a one-time right to change to the Standard Production Allocation. Due to the recalculation of the Storage Allocation Percentage necessitated when a Party changes to the Standard Production Allocation, the WATERMASTER will maintain the up-to-date Seaside Basin Storage Allocation Percentages.

"Storage and Recovery Agreement" means an agreement between WATERMASTER and a Party for Storage pursuant to Section III.L.3.j.xx.

"Store" and other variations of the same verb refer to the activities establishing Stored Water in the Seaside Basin.

"Stored Water" means (1) Non-Native Water introduced into the Seaside Basin by a Party or any predecessors-in-interest by Spreading or Directly Injecting that Water into the Seaside Basin for Storage and subsequent Extraction by and for the benefit of that Party or their successors-in-interest; (2) Groundwater within the Seaside Basin that is accounted for as a Producer's Carryover; or (3) Non-Native water introduced into the Basin through purchases by the WATERMASTER, and used to reduce and ultimately reverse Over-Production.

"Stored Water Credit" means the quantity of Stored Water augmenting the Basin's Retrievable Groundwater Supply, which is attributable to a Party's Storage and further governed by this Decision and a Storage and Recovery Agreement.

"Total Useable Storage Space" means the maximum amount of space available in the Seaside Basin that can prudently be used for Storage as shall be determined and modified by WATERMASTER pursuant to Section III.L.3.j.xix, less Storage space which may be reserved by the WATERMASTER for its use in recharging the Basin.

**ATTACHMENT B**  
**WATER QUALITY**

## Summary of WY 2010 Water Quality Data Injectate

Parameter	Unit	PQL	Sampling Results										WY 2010
			12/16/09	1/22/10	2/3/10	2/16/10	3/2/10	3/17/10	4/14/10	5/7/10	5/12/10	6/2/10	Injectate
Sample Description			Injectate	Injectate	Injectate	Injectate	Injectate	Injectate	Injectate	Injectate	Injectate	Injectate	Averages
<b>Major Cations</b>													
Calcium	mg/L	1	42	42		40		41	42		41		41
Magnesium	mg/L	1	15	14		13		12	13		14		14
Potassium	mg/L	0.5	3.4	3.2		2.8		2.9	3		2.9		3.0
Sodium	mg/L	1	44	41		43		43	40		41		42
<b>Major Anions</b>													
Bicarbonate (as HCO3-)	mg/L	10	157	154		157		155	157		151		155
Chloride	mg/L	1	27	27	25	26	25	28	28		26	23	26
Sulfate	mg/L	1	95	82		69		68	62		74		75
<b>General Physical</b>													
pH	Std Units	0.1	7.6	7.6		7.5		7.6	7.5		7.5		7.6
Specific Conductance (EC)	uS	10	522	528		494		493	470		486		499
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	10	355	385		348		300	288		308		331
<b>Metals</b>													
Arsenic (Total)	ug/L	1	ND	ND		ND		ND	ND		ND		0
Barium (Total)	ug/L	10	63	56		57		55	ND		61		49
Iron (Dissolved)	ug/L	50	ND	ND		ND		ND	ND		ND		0
Iron (Total)	ug/L	50	ND	ND		ND		ND	ND		55		9.2
Lithium	ug/L	1	4	6		7		5	5		5		5
Manganese (Dissolved)	ug/L	20	ND	ND		ND		ND	ND		ND		0
Manganese (Total)	ug/L	20	ND	ND		ND		ND	ND		ND		0
Molybdenum	ug/L	1	2	2		3		3	3		3		2.7
Nickel	ug/L	1	2	2				ND	ND		ND		0.8
Selenium	ug/L	2	ND	3		ND		ND	2		ND		0.8
Strontium (Total)	ug/L	5	236	216		218		200	203		213		214
Uranium (by ICP/MS)	ug/L	1	ND	ND		ND		ND	ND		ND		0
Vanadium (Total)	ug/L	1	2	2		2		ND	ND		ND		1
Zinc (Total)	ug/L	10	296	220		286		194	183		242		237
<b>Miscellaneous</b>													
Alkalinity, Total (as CaCO3)	mg/L	10	129	126		129		127	129		124		127.3333333
Ammonia-N	mg/L	0.05	ND	ND		0.05		0.06	ND		0.09		0.03
Boron	mg/L	0.01	0.04	0.04		0.38		0.07	ND		ND		0.09
Chloramines	mg/L	0.05	0.08	0.10	0.12	0.2	0.15	0.11	0.09		ND	ND	0.09
Fluoride	mg/L	0.1	0.2			0.33		0.26	0.28		0.27		0.27
Gross Alpha	pCi/L		1.89 +/- 1.05	ND +/- 1.1				0.444 +/- 0.694	0.187 +/- 1.13		-0.029 +/- 1.06		
Kjeldahl Nitrogen (Total)	mg/L	0.2	ND	ND		ND		ND	ND		ND		0
Methane	ug/L	0.4	ND	ND		ND		ND	ND		ND		0
Nitrate (as NO3)	mg/L	1	ND	ND		1		1	ND		ND		0.3
Nitrite (as Nitrogen)	mg/L	0.1	ND	ND		ND		ND	ND		ND		0
Nitrogen (Total)	mg/L	0.2	ND	ND		ND		ND	ND		ND		0.000
o-Phosphate-P	mg/L	0.1	0.3	ND		ND		0.2	0.2		0.5		0.2
Phosphorous (Total)	mg/L	0.03	0.32	ND		ND		0.29	0.25		0.55		0.24
Radium 226	pCi/L		0.148 +/- 0.29	ND +/- 0.16				0.418 +/- 0.335	0.0662 +/- 0.22		0.0535 +/- 0.348		
<b>Organic Analyses</b>													
Haloacetic Acids (Total)	ug/L	1.0	14	6	9.8	11	12	16	15	19		15	13
Dibromoacetic Acid	ug/L	1.0	2.2	ND	2.4	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.4	2.3		2.2	2.0
Dichloroacetic Acid	ug/L	1.0	6.4	2.1	3.8	4.8	5.2	6.5	5.5	7.7		6.5	5.4
Monobromoacetic Acid	ug/L	1.0	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	2		ND	0.22
Monochloroacetic Acid	ug/L	2.0	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	2.5	2.8	ND		ND	0.59
Trichloroacetic Acid	ug/L	1.0	5.7	3.9	3.6	3.7	4.3	5.3	4.0	7.2		6.6	4.9
Organic Carbon (Dissolved)	mg/L	0.2	1.3	1.0		1.1		1.1	1.1		1.3		1.2
Organic Carbon (Total)	mg/L	0.2	1.6	0.98		1.0		1.4	1.4		1.3		1.3
Trihalomethanes (Total)	ug/L	1.0	26	45	19	17	20	22	21	32		25	25
Bromodichloromethane	ug/L	0.5	8.5	14.0	7.1	6.2	6.9	7.6	6.9	10.0		8.6	8.4
Bromoform	ug/L	0.5	0.7	ND	0.67	0.59	0.64	0.62	0.71	0.66		ND	0.51
Chloroform	ug/L	1.0	11.0	26.0	5.7	5.8	8.4	9.6	8.6	15.0		12.0	11.3
Dibromochloromethane	ug/L	0.5	5.5	5.0	5.6	4.3	4.4	4.6	4.8	5.8		4.6	5.0
<b>Field Parameters</b>													
Temperature	° C		15.2	14.5	14.8	14.7	14.4		15.7	16.1	16.3	16.1	15.3
Specific Conductance (EC)	uS		568	328	559	487	520		476	492	490	501	491
pH	Std Units		7.1	7.4	7.5	7.4	7.3		7.2	7.3	7.3	7.3	7.3
ORP	mV		731	770		727							743
Free Chlorine Residual	mg/L		1.0	1.1	0.7	0.4	0.2		0.3	0.4	0.9	0.3	0.6
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L		1.6	1.6	0.8	2.4	4.3		2.1	2.6	3.7	2.2	2.4
Silt Density Index	Std Units		1.6										1.6
Gas Volume	mL		0.5										0.5
H2S	mg/L		ND										0

**Comparison of Average Water Quality Characteristics:  
Carmel River Basin vs. Seaside Groundwater Basin**

All units are in milligrams per liter

Water Source	Total Dissolved Solids	CATIONS				ANIONS			
		Calcium	Sodium	Magnesium	Potassium	Bicarbonate	Chloride	Sulfate	Nitrate (as NO3)
Carmel River	211	35	15	12	1.4	--	11	29	0.8
CV Aquifer Subunit 1	223	40	--	13	--	212	18	--	1.4
CV Aquifer Subunit 2	346	51	--	16	--	236	37	--	1.8
CV Aquifer Subunit 3	502	72	46	26	4.1	149	53	210	0.8
CV Aquifer Subunit 4	641	103	49	30	3.9	212	58	241	0.4
Seaside Basin (Tsm aquifer)	618	85	88	19	5.3	273	120	95	<1.0
WY 2010 Cal-Am injectate	331	41	42	14	3.0	155	26	75	0.3

NOTES:

1. Data source for Carmel River water quality from California-American Water (Cal-Am) annual water quality reports; average surface water for 1990-96.
2. Data source for Carmel Valley (CV) Aquifer Subunit water quality from Cal-Am records: Subunit 1 - Russell #4 well (6 analyses); Subunit 2 - Laureles #6 well (5 analyses); Subunit 3 - Schulte well (14 analyses); Subunit 4 - Canada well (10 analyses).
3. Data source for Seaside Basin (Santa Margarita [Tsm] aquifer) from ASR-1 well 3/21/2001 sample, prior to Tsm injection in basin. Analytic results in *Summary of Operations, Well Construction and Testing, Santa Margarita Test Injection Well* (Padre Associates, Inc., May 2002, Appendix D).
4. Total Dissolved Solids concentrations for CV Subunit 1 and 2 data were derived by multiplying Electrical Conductance by 0.65, per USGS Water-Supply Paper 2254 (John Hem, 1985, page 67).
5. Bicarbonate concentrations for CV and Tsm aquifer data were derived by multiplying Total Alkalinity concentrations by 1.22, as determined from milliequivalent ratio.
6. WY 2010 Cal-Am injectate data are averages from 10 samples collected during ASR operations. Results in *Summary of Operations, Phase 1 ASR Project, Water Year 2010* (Pueblo Water Resources, July 2011 [draft], Table 14).

/u:\joe\excel\ssmon\quality\crb\_sgb\_compare\_25jul11.xls

9/7/11

**SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN  
WATERMASTER**

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Robert S. Jaques, Technical Program Manager  
MODIFIED AND APPROVED BY: Dewey D Evans, CEO

DATE: September 7, 2011

SUBJECT: Discussion/Possible Temporary Suspension of Public Member Position on  
the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

-----  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Temporarily suspend the position of Public Member on the TAC, thereby reducing the TAC membership from 10 to 9.
2. Resume posting an announcement soliciting qualified persons to submit applications to fill the Public Member position.
3. Reinstate the Public Member position once the Board has selected a qualified applicant to fill the position.

**BACKGROUND:**

At its November 3, 2010 meeting the Board directed Staff to solicit names of persons for consideration by the Board to fill the then-vacant Public Member position on the TAC.

An announcement describing the Public Member position was posted on the Watermaster's website, and was also sent directly to all Board members and the administrative managers of their respective entities. Only one individual, Mr. Richard Willis, submitted a statement of interest, and the Board subsequently selected Mr. Willis to fill the Public Member position.

**DISCUSSION**

Mr. Willis recently submitted his resignation, and the Public Member position is therefore again vacant. At the TAC's August 10, 2011 meeting, the vacancy of this position, coupled with two of the other TAC members being unable to attend, nearly resulted in there being a lack of quorum, which would have prevented the TAC from holding its scheduled meeting.

Because there are sometimes conflicting meeting schedules among the TAC members that prevent them from attending TAC meetings, having one of the TAC membership positions vacant will increase the possibility that a lack of quorum will prevent the TAC from conducting its meetings. If that were to happen, certain of the work activities that are required under the Court Decision, and which must be reported on in the Annual Report, would fall behind schedule.



The Public Member position remained vacant for a number of months before Mr. Willis submitted his application for the position. It may be a number of months before another candidate can be found to fill the position. The TAC therefore recommends that the Board consider temporarily suspending the Public Member position on the TAC, so that the TAC membership would be reduced from 10 to 9 members. This would lower the number of members that must be present to constitute a quorum from 6 to 5.

The Watermaster could re-post the announcement it previously posted on its website to solicit candidates for the position, and reinstate the position when a qualified applicant has been selected by the Board.

**ITEM X.**

**INFORMATIONAL  
REPORTS**

**(NO ACTION REQUIRED)**

ANNUAL MILESTONES	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	9/7/2011	
Each Producer is authorized to Produce its Production Allocation within the designated Subarea in each of the first three Water Years. Alternative Producers may change to Standard Production by March 27, 2009 by filing a declaraton with the Court and with the other parties.	27-Mar-06	30-Sep-07	APA to SPA election amended to in perpetuity 12/12/2009										
Commencing with the fourth Water Year and Triennially thereafter, the Operating Yield for both Subareas will be decreased by 10% until the Operating Yield is equivalent to the Natural Safe Yield unless by recharge or reclaimed water use results in a decrease in production of Native Water as required by the decision.				100% of the Operating Yield of 5,600 decreased 10% Oct 1, 2009		Operating yield could decrease 10% every three years on October 1st until it is the equivalent of Natural Safe Yield		1-Oct	1-Oct	1-Oct			
Each Water Year by November 15th, the Watermaster will determine and levy a Replenishment Assessment on each Standard Producer, with payment due from Producer 40 days after the levy is mailed. After the close of each Water Year, the Watermaster will determine and levy a Replenishment Assessment against all Producers that incurred Operating Yield Over Production during the Water Year, with payment due from Producer by January 15th		15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov		
California American Water to submit annually to Watermaster any augmentation to water supply for possible credit toward Replenishment Assessment	Annually	15-Nov	CAW Credit Request Granted (signed MOU) January 15, 2009	CAW Credit Req Granted 2/3/10	CAW Credit Req Granted 2/2/11	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov		
Water level monitoring - monthly data collection from all members for inclusion in the consolidated database.	Reported Annually	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly		
Water quality monitoring - yearly data collection from all members for inclusion in consolidated database	Reported Annually	15-Nov	28-Feb & 15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov		
Summary report of water resources data to all members/parties Reported the 15th each quarter month: Annual Report to Court	Quarterly	15-Jan	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	23-Dec							
			Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th		
			15-Nov	15-Nov	23-Dec								
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE MILESTONES</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>		
Adjudication ordered by Court and filed	27-Mar-06												
Board Directors Terms		7-Nov											
Budget (Administrative) Adopted/distributed					15-Jan-10	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan		
Budget (Operations) Adopted/distributed					15-Jan-10	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan		
Budget (Replenishment)Adopted/distributed					15-Jan-10	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan		
Administrative Assessments	15-Jan-06	15-Jan-07	15-Jan-08	15-Jan-09	15-Jan-10	15-Jan-11	15-Jan-12	15-Jan-13	15-Jan-14	15-Jan-15	15-Jan-16		
Operations Assessments	15-Jan-07	15-Jan-07	15-Jan-08	15-Jan-09	15-Jan-10	15-Jan-11	15-Jan-12	15-Jan-13	15-Jan-14	15-Jan-15	15-Jan-16		
Capital Assessments	15-Jan-07	15-Jan-07	NONE	15-Jan-09	NONE	NONE	15-Jan-12	15-Jan-13	15-Jan-14	15-Jan-15	15-Jan-16		
Replenishment Assessments	CAW credit	CAW credit	CAW credit	CAW credit	CAW credit	CAW credit	15-Jan-13	15-Jan-14	15-Jan-15	15-Jan-16	15-Jan-17		
Annual Report to Court	15-Nov-06	15-Nov-07	15-Nov-08	15-Nov-09	23-Dec-10		15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov		
Answers to Judge's Questions re: Annual Report		30-Jan-09	28-Feb-08	1-Feb-09	5-Feb-10	None							
Declaration of Replenishment Water Availability	Feb-06	Dec-06	Dec-07	18 Mar	2-Dec-09	1-Dec-10	Dec-11	Dec-12	Dec-13	Dec-14	Dec-15		
<b>MONTHLY MILESTONES</b>	<b>2006-10</b>	<b>Jan 11</b>	<b>Feb 11</b>	<b>Mar 11</b>	<b>Apr 11</b>	<b>May 11</b>	<b>Jun 11</b>	<b>Jul 11</b>	<b>Aug 11</b>	<b>Sep 11</b>	<b>Oct 11</b>	<b>Nov 11</b>	<b>Dec 11</b>
Board Directors Terms												Election for '12	
Fiscal Year tentative budgets distribution to all parties												Budgets presented	
Operating Yield of 5,600 decreased 10% ; Declaration of Replenishment Water Available	18-Mar-09											Declaration to be made	
Administrative Assessments												2009, 10 & 11 Seaside Not Recvd	
Operations Assessments												2009, 10 & 11 Seaside Not Recvd	
Capital Assessments												2009, 10 & 11 Seaside Not Recvd	
Replenishment Assessments												In-Lieu Offset in progress	
Develop Repl Assessment Unit Cost												Same as last yr	
<b>SPECIAL ISSUES</b>	<b>2006-10</b>	<b>Jan 11</b>	<b>Feb 11</b>	<b>Mar 11</b>	<b>Apr 11</b>	<b>May 11</b>	<b>Jun 11</b>	<b>Jul 11</b>	<b>Aug 11</b>	<b>Sep 11</b>	<b>Oct 11</b>	<b>Nov 11</b>	<b>Dec 11</b>
Cal-Am CWP/Alternative Projects EIR	Ratepayer Advocates Issue			CPUC Certification and Final N.O.D.									
SWRCB Cease Desist Order California American Water	In Effect												
Storage and Recovery Application and Agreement Development	Templates Approved										CAW Storage Agreement		
<b>Watermaster Board Regular Meeting Schedule</b>		5-Jan cancel'd	2-Feb	2-Mar cancel'd	6-Apr cancel'd	4-May	1-Jun cancel'd	6-Jul cancel'd	3-Aug cancel'd	7-Sep	5-Oct	2-Nov	7-Dec
<b>SUMMARY PROJECT SCHEDULE</b> (See detailed project schedule for more information)													
<b>Program Administration, Database Management (MPWMD)</b>				1/1/11 - 12/31/11									
<b>Coastal Wells Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential Evaluation (MPWMD)</b>				06/01/11 - 12/31/11								Complete =	
<b>Production Water Level &amp; Water Quality Monitoring (Hydrometrics, MPWMD)</b>				1/1/11 - 12/31/11								Yet to be completed =	
<b>Refine/Update BMAP (Hydrometrics)</b>				1/1/11-12/31/11								Scheduled for Board or TAC meeting =	
<b>Seawater Intrusion Analysis (Hydrometrics)</b>				10/6/11-11/2/11								Imminent Critical Deadline =	
													Revised August 18, 2011

**D-R-A-F-T**  
**MINUTES**

**Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster  
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting  
May 11, 2011**

**Attendees: TAC Members**  
City of Seaside – Rick Riedl  
California American Water – Eric Sabolsice  
City of Monterey – Norm Green  
Laguna Seca Property Owners – Bob Costa  
MPWMD – Joe Oliver  
Public Member – Richard Willis  
MCWRA – No Representative  
City of Del Rey Oaks – No Representative  
City of Sand City – Richard Simonitch  
Coastal Subarea Landowners – No Representative

**Watermaster**  
Technical Program Manager - Robert Jaques

**Consultants**  
None

**Others:**  
None

---

The meeting was called to order at 1:34 p.m.

**1. Administrative Matters:**

**A. Approve Minutes from March 9, 2011 Meeting**

On a motion by Mr. Costa, seconded by Mr. Riedl, the Minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

**2. Continued Discussion of Changes to the Inputting and Management of Data in the Watermaster Database**

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials for this item.

Mr. Costa reported that at the last Watermaster Board meeting, which he attended, Mr. Anthony of CAW appeared concerned that the agenda item regarding revisions to the Rules and Regulations of the Watermaster did not make it clear that one of the revisions would require water meter readings to be submitted. Mr. Costa reported that Mr. Anthony's concern did not appear to be that providing such data should not be done, rather than it had not been properly agendized for action by the Board.

Mr. Oliver explained that having water meter readings is helpful in resolving discrepancies in reported production quantities.

Mr. Sabolsice described CAW's water meter reading systems and procedures. He said he needed to research what CAW's water meter reading schedule is in order to see if their procedures would match the proposed reporting schedule. It was agreed that this topic would be carried over for discussion at the June TAC meeting.

Mr. Riedl asked if entities could submit their water quality data in electronic form. Mr. Oliver said that MPWMD collects water quality data for most of the reporting entities, and receives that data from the laboratory in electronic form, but for those entities that collect their own water quality data, this suggestion could be made to see if they are interested. Also, it would be good to re-notify them that if they would like the Watermaster (via MPWMD under contract to the Watermaster) to collect their water quality and/or water level data (at a cost) they can request that. Mr. Jaques will pursue this with Mr. Evans.

With regard to the proposed reporting format for water quality data, Mr. Riedl said he did not feel that the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) should be provided, rather the Practical Quantification Limit (PQL) should be provided. There was consensus that this change should be made.

Mr. Oliver said he will coordinate directly with their IT consultant with regard to hosting the database on the MPWMD server.

Mr. Sabolsice said he was supportive of making the changes as presented in the agenda packet, along with the revisions discussed above.

Mr. Willis asked if the reports under the new Access database approach would include additional parameters. Mr. Oliver responded that the Access database will be configured to include additional parameters that the original database was not designed to include.

Mr. Willis suggested that a note be added in the database including saying that data which is earlier than that shown in the database is not available.

Mr. Willis recommended adding a link on the Website, if possible, to "Open Office" , so people who do not have Excel software can download it free in order to be able to use the Excel files from the database.

Mr. Sabolsice recommended that legal research with regard to information that might be confidential only be undertaken if a request comes in for information that has the potential to be considered confidential data.

On the motion by Mr. Sabolsice, second by Mr. Riedl, the proposed changes in how the database is populated and managed were unanimously approved with the revisions described above.

### **3. Continued Discussion of Offer by Pasadera to Discuss Possible Use of Storm Water Runoff from Pasadera as a Water Source for Helping to Recharge the Seaside Basin**

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials for this item. He reported that Mr. Leonard had been out of the office for some time due to a medical issue.

Mr. Oliver reported that Byron Leonard (Dean Leonard's son) may be taking over some of the duties previously performed by Dean Leonard. Mr. Jaques will try to contact Byron Leonard to discuss these issues.

### **4. Progress Report on Wellhead Surveying Work**

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials on this item.

Mr. Green and Mr. Oliver briefly discussed natural earth movements that David Edson of Central Coast Surveyors will take into account in preparing his report on the well head surveying work.

Mr. Oliver said that some other basins have experienced subsidence on the order of feet to many feet.

Mr. Sabolsice said that any mapping provided along with the wellhead survey report should not show specific locations of wells, as that may be confidential information.

### **5. Schedule**

Mr. Jaques briefly summarized some of the Schedule milestones and noted that next month's TAC meeting would include discussion with regard to the Regional Water Project and Scenario 2 groundwater modeling, as previously agreed to by the TAC.

### **6. Other Business**

Mr. Sabolsice reported that approximately 1,000 acre feet of ASR water has been injection into the Seaside Groundwater Basin this year. Mr. Green asked if the water was treated before being injected, and Mr. Sabolsice responded that it is treated at CAW's Begonia Iron Removal Plant before it is injected. He reported that the cost for this water is less than \$1,000 per acre foot, compared to \$2,000 or more per acre foot for desalinated water.

Mr. Green urged that ways to capture and treat/reuse storm water runoff be looked into.

Mr. Oliver said that MPWMD had done some evaluations of this topic in the past. Mr. Sabolsice also said that his firm had done some work for the city of Pacific Grove on capture/reuse of storm water, but the cost was on the order of \$4,000 per acre foot which is much more costly than desalinated water. Mr. Sabolsice went on to say that conservation is a good approach to help reduce demands on both the Carmel and Seaside basins.

Mr. Simonitch reported that military installations use a lot of water.

Mr. Riedl asked if they would be possible to get an update from MRWPCA on the Groundwater Replenishment Project and the Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project. Mr. Jaques will pursue this request with MRWPCA.

Mr. Jaques asked if the TAC would like to have an item on a future TAC agenda for a discussion of ideas and approaches to help augment the Regional Water Project. It was agreed that this could potentially be done in conjunction with discussions at the next meeting with regard to the Regional Water Project and Scenario 2 groundwater modeling.

**7. Set next meeting date:**

The next regular meeting was set for Wednesday, June 8, 2011 at 1:30 p.m. at the MRWPCA Board Room.

The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

**D-R-A-F-T**  
**MINUTES**

**Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster  
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting  
June 8, 2011**

**Attendees: TAC Members**  
City of Seaside – Rick Riedl  
California American Water – Eric Sabolsice  
City of Monterey – Norm Green  
Laguna Seca Property Owners – Bob Costa  
MPWMD – Jon Lear  
Public Member – Richard Willis  
MCWRA – Rob Johnson  
City of Del Rey Oaks – Dan Dawson  
City of Sand City – Richard Simonitch  
Coastal Subarea Landowners – No Representative

**Watermaster**  
Technical Program Manager - Robert Jaques

**Consultants**  
None

**Others:**  
MRWPCA - Bob Holden  
MCWD – Carl Niizawa  
City of Del Rey Oaks – Dennis Allion (Councilmember, City of Del Rey Oaks City Council)

---

The meeting was called to order at 1:33 p.m.

**1. Administrative Matters:**

**A. Approve Minutes from May 11, 2011 Meeting**

Mr. Riedl requested a revision to paragraph 3 on page 4 of the Agenda packet. His requested revision was to clarify that the suggestion to use the PQL rather than the MCL was recommended by Mr. Oliver, not by himself.

Mr. Dawson asked Mr. Sabolsice if the study on Pacific Grove storm water was available for review. Mr. Sabolsice said he would try to get a copy and provide it to Mr. Dawson. Mr. Riedl asked if it could be made available to the full TAC, and Mr. Jaques will do so what he receives it from Mr. Sabolsice.

Mr. Dawson pointed out a typographical error to be corrected on page 5.



With these revisions made, on a motion by Mr. Riedl, second by Mr. Green, the minutes were unanimously approved.

At this point in the meeting, because of an upcoming meeting schedule conflict, Mr. Sabolsice asked if the TAC was agreeable to moving to Agenda item number 4, so he could be present for discussion on that topic before having to excuse himself from the meeting. The TAC was agreeable to moving to item 4.

**4. Discussion of:**

**A. Issues and Timing Pertaining to Groundwater Modeling of Scenario 2 – the Regional Water Supply Project**

**B. Updating the BMAP**

**C. Refining Protective Water Levels**

**Regional Water Supply Project**

Mr. Sabolsice reported that a meeting had recently been held involving representatives from MCWD, RMC, and CAW to discuss preliminary design issues for the Regional Water Supply Project. He said the current concept is to use a design-build process. Due to Coastal Commission permitting and architectural issues, special consideration needs to be given to the architectural design aspects of the facilities. This work will be bid by MCWD, once the design is complete.

A Request for Proposals is currently out for design services for the CAW-only portion of the Project, consisting of pipelines, ASR facilities, and terminal storage tanks. Mr. Sabolsice described the various pipelines that will be included within the project, and noted that the ASR facilities would be located between Fitch School and Fitch Park. Mr. Riedl asked for a copy of the RFP, and Mr. Sabolsice said he would see if he could make this available from CAW's Engineering Department. Mr. Sabolsice reported that the CAW design contract will firm-up the specifics of the Project, the preliminary parameters of which are outlined on page 22 of the Agenda packet for today's meeting. Mr. Riedl asked Mr. Sabolsice for the currently projected design completion date for the CAW-only facilities. Mr. Sabolsice's estimate was approximately six months from the date of contract award.

Mr. Costa asked Mr. Sabolsice what the deadline was for construction of the Project to be completed in order to comply with the Cease and Desist Order deadline established by the SWRCB, and at what point the Project could become in jeopardy of causing noncompliance with the Cease and Desist Order, if the Project were to be further delayed. Mr. Sabolsice said that MPWMD's water conservation measures, including rationing, would go into effect if certain milestone deadlines in the Cease and Desist Order were not met.

Mr. Johnson reported that a Public Participation meeting about the Regional Water Supply Project will be held on Wednesday June 15th, 2011 from 6:30 to 8:30 PM at the Seaside Community Center. This will be an informative meeting for persons interested in getting more detailed information regarding the status and other aspects of the Project. The Piper-Jaffee financing plan for the Project will also be discussed at that meeting.

Mr. Dawson requested that a "Public Comment" item be added as the first item on all future TAC meeting agendas. There was TAC concurrence on this recommendation, and Mr. Jaques will make this change for future agendas.

Mr. Sabolsice departed the meeting at this point in order to attend another meeting.

Mr. Johnson said that test wells for the desalination plant intake are being held up by litigation as well as issues pertaining to obtaining access to the land where they would be located. He said that RMC has submitted the Coastal Commission permit application for both slant and vertical wells. Vertical wells are the only ones that have issues of concern associated with the litigation that has been filed. Data from the pilot wells will not be available in September as previously projected, due to these delaying factors. The Coastal Commission is holding up issuance of the permit for the vertical wells due to the litigation. More updating will come out at the June 15th public meeting mentioned above.

Mr. Willis asked if hazard mitigation, for example tsunamis and earthquakes, are being addressed in the design, and Mr. Johnson responded that they were.

Mr. Riedl asked if financing had been secured for the wells, and Mr. Johnson responded that financing had not yet been secured, but that various alternative financing possibilities were being examined.

#### **Other Potential Supplemental Water Projects**

Mr. Jaques briefly summarized the projects listed on pages 14 through 18 of the agenda packet in order to open discussion on this topic. The following questions and answers came up during those discussions:

**Project 5 (MPWMD's 95-10 Desal Plant):** Mr. Riedl asked Mr. Lear why the project was being designed only for 2 MGD, and why it was being proposed to locate it at the former Monterey wastewater treatment plant site. Mr. Lear responded that site location and sizing were based on a number of factors including hydrogeologic issues, the size of available sites, and the fact that the purpose of the project was to provide water to serve future development, not to meet the full 10 MGD amount needed to satisfy the Cease and Desist Order for SWRCB Order No. 95-10.

**Project 7 (Salinas River Surface Water Treatment Plant):** Mr. Johnson said that this project is not currently being actively pursued. Mr. Holden said it may have been moved to Phase 2, from Phase 1, when the final EIR for the Coastal Water Project was issued. Mr. Johnson said he would look into this and provide further information at a future meeting.

**Project 9 (Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project):** Mr. Niizawa noted that winter storage is being evaluated as a way of enhancing the project.

Mr. Dawson asked about the membership in the Leadership Committee that was recently created for this project and where its meetings were being held. Mr. Holden responded that the Board Chairmen and General Managers of the two entities constitute the Leadership Committee. He said one meeting had been held, and a second meeting is currently being planned, with the location yet to be determined.

Mr. Niizawa reported that a \$40 million SRF loan funding request had been made by MCWD to the SWRCB for the RUWAP. It was approved as being eligible for approximately \$35 million. He said that user agreements will be required before the SWRCB will actually issue a loan. There was discussion of various questions pertaining to financing and other aspects of the RUWAP as posed by TAC members to Mr. Niizawa.

Mr. Dawson asked about the status of expanding the RUWAP to serve the Laguna Seca and Pasadera golf courses. Mr. Holden responded that a request to expand the project to those areas had been sent to Monterey County, but at this point no action had been taken by the County in response to that request.

Mr. Riedl asked if the CAW desalination pipeline could be used for delivery of recycled water for this project. Mr. Lear responded that a similar proposal had been made for a project in Pajaro and had been rejected by the California Department of Public Health. Mr. Niizawa concurred, and also noted that recycled water pipelines cannot be constructed in the same trench as potable water pipelines unless they are separated by a specified distance.

Project 11 (MRWPCA Groundwater Replenishment Project for the Seaside Basin): There were numerous questions and answers with regard to water quality and dilution water requirements for the GWRP. Mr. Holden explained that the current 1:1 dilution water requirement of the California Department of Public Health is a significant cost issue for the GWRP, and that if this is relaxed, it would be beneficial in terms of the financial aspects of implementing the project.

Project 12 (Seawater Conversion Vessel): Mr. Lear said that once every few years this comes up in public comments at MPWMD meetings, but to his knowledge nothing is being pursued by anyone at this time.

Project 13 (Pacific Grove Stormwater Project): This had been previously discussed as noted above under item 1.A in the Minutes. Mr. Dawson asked to get a copy of the regional storm water report prepared by MPWMD, and Mr. Jaques said he would provide a copy via e-mail to all TAC members.

Project 14 (Conservation): Mr. Lear said that average water usage per residential connection has gone down from about 0.6 acre feet per year to about 0.283 acre feet per year, and that the slope of this declining curve is now approaching flatness. He said MPWMD is looking into further conservation and/or rationing measures which might be necessary to comply with the Cease and Desist Order and the Seaside Basin Adjudication Decision.

Mr. Jaques requested direction from TAC members on what projects they would like to discuss in further detail at future TAC meetings, and the following recommendations were made:

1. Mr. Riedl suggested learning more about the desalination project proposed for the Kaiser Refractories site. Mr. Lear said the initial concept was found not to be feasible, but he understood that some revisions may be in the progress of being made to the concept to address those concerns.
2. Mr. Riedl suggested Pueblo Water Rights also be examined. Mr. Johnson commented that a lawsuit against Monterey County on this issue had been filed some time ago, but he did not recall the outcome of the litigation.

3. Mr. Jaques suggested that capture and reuse of storm water be a topic for further TAC consideration.

4. Mr. Riedl suggested that modified pumping of wells to inject water to build a freshwater mound (as described in the Minutes from the May 11, 2011 TAC meeting on page 5 of the agenda packet) also be a concept for further evaluation.

Mr. Jaques will research these projects and concepts and prepare materials on them for discussion at a future TAC meeting.

There was consensus to defer further discussion of Modeling Scenario No. 2, as well as updating the Basin Management Action Plan and refining Protective Water Levels, until a future date when more data is known with regard to the pilot test wells, which are currently being held up by litigation and other issues.

**2. Status Report on Implementing Changes to the Inputting and Management of Data in the Watermaster Database**

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials on this item, and there was no other discussion on it.

**3. Status Report on Offer by Pasadera to Discuss Possible Use of Storm Water Runoff from Pasadera as a Water Source for Helping to Recharge the Seaside Basin**

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials on this item, and there was no other discussion on it.

**5. Schedule**

Mr. Jaques reported that he hoped to have a report on the wellhead resurvey work for the July TAC meeting.

**6. Other Business**

There was no other business.

**7. Set next meeting date:**

**The next regular meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 13, 2011 at 1:30 p.m. at the MRWPCA Board Room**

The meeting adjourned at 3:21 p.m.

**D-R-A-F-T**  
**MINUTES**

**Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster  
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting  
August 10, 2011**

**Attendees: TAC Members**  
City of Seaside – Scott Ottmar  
California American Water – Eric Sabolsice  
City of Monterey – No representative  
Laguna Seca Property Owners – Bob Costa  
MPWMD – Joe Oliver  
Public Member – No representative  
MCWRA – Rob Johnson  
City of Del Rey Oaks – No representative  
City of Sand City – Richard Simonitch  
Coastal Subarea Landowners – No Representative

**Watermaster**  
Technical Program Manager - Robert Jaques  
Dewey Evans - Executive Officer  
Laura Dadiw - Administration

**Consultants**  
HydroMetrics – Derrick Williams (by telephone)

**Others:**  
MPWMD – Jon Lear  
MCWD – Carl Niizawa

---

The meeting was called to order at 1:39 p.m. (start of meeting delayed while waiting for the arrival of a quorum of TAC members).

**1. Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

**2. Administrative Matters:**

**A. Approve Minutes from June 8, 2011 Meeting**

On a motion by Mr. Oliver, seconded by Mr. Costa, the minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

**3. MPWMD Progress Reports:**

**A. Implementing Changes to the Inputting and Management of Data in the Watermaster Database**

**B. Evaluating Coastal Wells for Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential**

Mr. Oliver reported that Agenda items 3.A and 3.B were very closely coordinated schedule-wise, so these two Agenda topics were discussed together.

Mr. Oliver briefly summarized the work that is being done on making the Database revisions. Mr. Lear reported that he will be meeting with Monterey Bay Analytical Services (the laboratory) to discuss water quality data issues on August 17. Mr. Oliver said he saw no problem getting the work completed, except that the cross-aquifer contamination work will provide well information that needs to go into the Database. The Database work is proceeding on schedule, but inputting this new data will be done as it is acquired.

Mr. Oliver handed out a September 2010 Technical Memo prepared by a company named Right on Q Hydrology titled "Seaside Groundwater Basin Cross-Contamination Wells Investigation." Mr. Oliver reported that information in that report is being used in the cross-aquifer contamination work by MPWMD. Mr. Oliver said he will coordinate with Rob Johnson to obtain MCWRA's data on wells within the Seaside Groundwater Basin.

Mr. Lear reviewed the Task list from page 17 of the Agenda packet and said that currently he is going through paper records to begin the work. Under Task 2 he has identified all logs for seals that may not have been properly placed. Under Task 6 he has identified wells screened in the Santa Margarita aquifer and is looking for abandoned wells. Mr. Lear reported that the work is turning out to be more complicated and time-consuming than originally anticipated, and is therefore taking longer than originally scheduled.

Mr. Jaques asked Mr. Lear when it would be possible to have a presentation made after the work has been completed. Mr. Lear said a progress report could be made in October, but it was still too early to forecast a completion date for the work. Mr. Oliver and Mr. Lear will work with Mr. Jaques to develop a "plug number" cost for inclusion in the FY 2012 Budget for possible further cross-aquifer contamination work.

Mr. Sabolsice asked Mr. Oliver what follow-up action would likely be recommended if cross-aquifer contamination potential appears to exist. Mr. Oliver responded that MPWMD will develop recommendations on this to include in their report. They will take into account well age and materials of construction in developing a prioritization list for follow-up work. Mr. Sabolsice and Mr. Oliver recommended communicating certain of this information to Monterey County Department of Environmental Health.

Mr. Simonitch asked Mr. Oliver how cross-aquifer contamination was related to complying with the requirements of the Decision. Mr. Oliver responded that cross-contamination between aquifers could influence the movement of seawater intrusion into the Seaside Groundwater Basin. As an example he explained that the Aromas and Paso Robles aquifers are well separated from the Santa Margarita aquifer near the coast, but that cross-contamination from a faulty well could allow seawater intrusion from these shallow aquifers to get into the deeper Santa Margarita aquifer.

#### **4. Status Report on Offer by Pasadera to Discuss Possible Use of Storm Water Runoff from Pasadera as a Water Source for Helping to Recharge the Seaside Basin**

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials for this item. No further action will be taken on this issue unless the Pasadera representative contacts the Watermaster.

## **5. Approve Draft Storage Agreement with California American Water**

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials for this item.

Mr. Simonitch noted that one ASR well would enable about 1,000 AFY of water to be stored in the Basin, and that with additional ASR wells being installed in the future (a total of 6 projected to be constructed) he asked why the proposed Storage Agreement limited the storage amount to only 2,426 AFY.

Mr. Jaques responded that this figure was set forth in the SWRCB's Division of Water Rights approval document. Mr. Oliver went on to say that once more ASR wells are completed, an amendment of the SWRCB approval document could be sought to increase this amount. Mr. Lear said that 2,426 AFY is based on the amount that the SWRCB currently allows to be diverted from the Carmel River.

Mr. Oliver noted that paragraph 4 of the proposed Storage Agreement, which describes the recovery locations, does not list all of CAW's wells in the Basin. Mr. Sabolsice responded that this is correct, and that only the listed wells would be used for recovery.

Mr. Williams asked if there had been any resolution of the issue with regard to recovery wells as covered in the language in the SWRCB's approval document. Mr. Oliver responded that the intent is to write a letter of clarification to the State on this matter, since CAW has been reporting usage of the listed recovery wells all along and this has been satisfactory and acceptable to the State.

Mr. Simonitch asked if additional storage from new ASR wells could be added to the Storage Agreement. Mr. Oliver and Mr. Jaques responded that this could be covered via an amendment to the Storage Agreement, once SWRCB approval to store greater quantities is received.

A motion was made by Mr. Simonitch, seconded by Mr. Johnson, to approve the Storage Agreement as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

## **6. Discussion of Topics Pertaining to Potential Supplemental Water Supply Projects**

Mr. Jaques briefly summarized each of the five projects discussed under this agenda item, and a discussion on each of these projects ensued.

With regard to Projects 1 (Regional Desalination Plant at the Kaiser Refractories Site) and 2 (Pueblo Water Rights) there was brief discussion and there was consensus that these projects did not warrant further investigation.

With regard to Project 3 (Storm Water) Mr. Sabolsice reported that only a very preliminary review of cost and feasibility of constructing a storm water storage basin at CAW's David Avenue reservoir site had been performed by CAW. Based on the information contained in the agenda packet, and some further discussion, there was consensus that at this time this project did not warrant further investigation.

With regard to Project 4 (Coastal Injection Barrier) Mr. Sabolsice asked how much water would be needed in order for wells located along the beach to create a barrier. Mr. Williams responded that probably several thousand acre feet per year would be needed. Mr. Williams went on to say that in his opinion only the imminent threat of seawater intrusion would warrant giving this project

further consideration, but not before that point in time. He went on to explain that under this type of project, some of the injected water would be lost to the ocean.

Mr. Sabolsice asked if the Basin water levels could be lowered if a coastal barrier was created and Mr. Williams responded yes.

Mr. Oliver commented that the previous modeling was based on injection into the Santa Margarita aquifer. Mr. Lear asked Mr. Williams if he had any recommendations with regard to which aquifer the injection water should be taken from, and which aquifer it should be injected to, under the coastal injection barrier approach. Mr. Williams responded that the Paso Robles aquifer is more susceptible to seawater intrusion than the Santa Margarita aquifer. However, he went on to say that if too much water was pulled from any aquifer it would lower water levels further in that aquifer, so it would be necessary to insure that the coastal barrier kept water levels in all aquifers above protective water levels to avoid seawater intrusion. In other words an injected water mound would need to be achieved in all aquifers so seawater could not intrude into any of the aquifers.

Mr. Williams went on to say that it would only take a few weeks to model this concept, so there was no pressing need to do this work at this time. The work could be performed when and if seawater intrusion was detected.

Mr. Sabolsice asked Mr. Jaques what the Watermaster could do to implement a coastal barrier project at this time, if it wanted to do so. Mr. Jaques responded that the Watermaster does not have the funds available to construct the necessary infrastructure that would include wells and pipelines, etc. for a coastal barrier project. Mr. Sabolsice commented that in the future some of the entities might want to consider providing funding for such a project, but that this did not appear likely at this time.

With regard to Project 5 (Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project) Mr. Niizawa reported that MCWD is currently finalizing pipeline easements for this project, and that was the extent of his update on the status of work on this project. Mr. Niizawa and Mr. Simonitch noted that recycled water distribution piping is being installed in some of the former Fort Ord areas as they are redeveloped, but the main conveyance pipeline from the Salinas Valley Reclamation Plant as well as the recycled water pump stations to deliver recycled water to the reuse sites have not been constructed.

Mr. Costa asked if there was any intent to deliver recycled water to the Highway 68 area. Mr. Niizawa said that some discussions had been held by MRWPCA about this concept, but he was unaware of any firm plans being pursued.

Mr. Costa asked if the RUWAP is a joint MCWD/MRWPCA project and Mr. Niizawa responded that it was. He explained that the MRWPCA would produce the recycled water, and MCWD would deliver the water.

A motion was made by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Costa, to receive the report contained in today's agenda packet for information, but not to pursue any of the five projects further at this time. The motion passed unanimously.



Mr. Oliver commented that the information contained in today's agenda packet might be useful in the future when the Basin Management Action Plan is updated.

#### **7. Progress Report on Wellhead Resurveying**

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials on this item.

Mr. Simonitch commented that the sandy soil strata in Basin meant that subsidence was not likely to occur as a result of groundwater levels falling. Mr. Oliver concurred with this observation.

There was TAC consensus that if the final report on the wellhead resurveying work confirms that no subsidence is occurring, there would be no need to perform further resurveying work, unless there was some indication that subsidence was occurring.

#### **8. Proposed Items to be Included in FY 2011-2012 M&MP Work Plan and Budget**

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet material for this item.

There were no recommendations by the TAC for changes or additions to the proposed work plan for the Management and Monitoring Program.

#### **9. Schedule**

Mr. Jaques briefly summarized the main updates that had been made to the Schedule.

With regard to ID numbers 56 through 60, 64 through 68, and 72 through 78, Mr. Sabolsice recommended deferring any further discussion of these activities until there is some specific event associated with the Coastal Water Project that would warrant reopening discussion on these topics, or if a TAC member requested that further discussion be held. Mr. Jaques will update the Schedule to show these as unscheduled activities.

#### **10. Other Business**

Mr. Simonitch said that the Sand City desalination plant is running very well and he complimented CAW for operating the plant in an excellent manner. He reported that nearly 300 acre feet of desalinated water have already been produced during 2011.

Mr. Jaques summarized an e-mail received from Richard Willis, Public Member of the TAC, reporting his decision to resign from the TAC.

Mr. Jaques said he intended to recommend to Mr. Evans that the Board consider temporarily eliminating the Public Member position on the TAC, while an effort is made to find a replacement for Mr. Willis. At such time as the Board finds a suitable replacement, the position could then be reinstated. This approach would help avoid having a problem with achieving quorum in order for the TAC to meet and conduct business. Mr. Jaques said he would also recommend to Mr. Evans that advertising for persons interested in filling the position be resumed on the Watermaster's web site.

#### **11. Set next meeting date:**

**The next regular meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 14, 2011 at 1:30 p.m. at the MRWPCA Board Room**

The meeting adjourned at 3:19 p.m.

# 2011 WATER YEAR

ITEM X.C.

## Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster

5/4/2011

Reported Quarterly and Annual Water Production (in Acre Feet) From the Seaside Groundwater Basin  
For All Producers Included in the Seaside Basin Adjudication

(All Values in Acre-Feet ([AF])

Producer	Type	Quarters				Annual To-Date Reported Total	Base Operating Yield Allocation	Carry Over from 2009/10	Total Allocation 2010/11	Stored Water Credit from 2009/10
		Oct-Dec 2010	Jan-Mar 2011	Apr-Jun 2011	Jul-Sep 2011					
<b><u>Coastal Subareas</u></b>										
CAW (Coastal Subareas)	SPA	0.0	110.0	1,399.7	0.0	1509.7	3,086.7	115.1	3,201.8	1,110.5
Seaside (Municipal)	SPA	60.2	45.7	64.1	0.0	169.9	253.1	-	253.1	-
Granite Rock Company	SPA	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	0.0	23.8	114.7	138.5	-
DBO Development No. 30	SPA	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	0.0	43.3	235.9	279.2	-
City of Seaside (Golf Courses)	APA	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	540.0	-	540.0	-
Sand City	APA	0.2	0.3	0.3	-	0.7	9.0	-	9.0	-
Security National Guaranty	APA	-	-	-	-	0.0	149.0	-	149.0	-
Cypress Pacific Investors*	APA	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	0.0	14.0	-	14.0	-
Alderwoods Group (Mission Memorial)	APA	3.3	2.3	8.0	0.0	13.6	31.0	-	31.0	-
<b>Coastal Subarea Totals</b>		<b>63.7</b>	<b>158.1</b>	<b>1,472.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1,693.9</b>	<b>4,149.9</b>	<b>465.7</b>	<b>4,615.6</b>	<b>1,110.5</b>
<i>Previous Year Totals (2009)</i>		<i>1,023.1</i>	<i>114.2</i>	<i>1,047.7</i>	<i>1,494.9</i>	<i>3,679.9</i>	<i>4,150.0</i>	<i>779.4</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>
<b><u>Laguna Seca Subareas</u></b>										
CAW (Inland Subareas)	SPA	86.9	63.0	103.7	-	253.6	246.1	-	246.1	-
Pasadera Country Club	APA	23.0	2.1	32.9	-	57.9	251.0	-	251.0	-
Laguna Seca/Bishop	APA	23.5	0.0	92.0	-	115.5	320.0	-	320.0	-
York School	APA	2.4	1.5	5.2	-	9.1	32.0	-	32.0	-
Laguna Seca Park (County)	APA	4.6	4.8	8.8	-	18.3	41.0	-	41.0	-
<b>Laguna Seca Subarea Totals</b>		<b>140.4</b>	<b>71.4</b>	<b>242.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>454.3</b>	<b>890.1</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>890.1</b>	<b>-</b>
<i>Previous Year Totals (2009)</i>		<i>142.8</i>	<i>72.9</i>	<i>245.7</i>	<i>406.3</i>	<i>867.7</i>	<i>890.1</i>	<i>779.4</i>	<i>890.1</i>	<i>-</i>
<b>Subtotal Pumped</b>		<b>204.0</b>	<b>229.6</b>	<b>1,714.6</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>2,148.2</b>	<b>5,040.0</b>	<b>465.7</b>	<b>5,505.7</b>	<b>1,110.5</b>
<b>Alternative Producers =</b>						<b>215.0</b>				
<b>Standard Producers =</b>						<b>1,933.2</b>				
<b><u>City of Seaside Golf Course In-lieu</u></b>										
Marina Coast Water District		28.8	32.5	162.1	0.0	223.4				
<b><u>CAW ASR (Injection)/Recovery</u></b>										
Monterey County District		1,040.9	(486.2)	(567.8)	0.0	(7.0)				

Notes:

1. The Water Year (WY) begins October 1 and ends September 30 of the following calendar year. For example, WY 2011 began on October 1, 2010, and ended on September 30, 2011.
2. "Type" refers to water right as described in Seaside Basin Adjudication decision as amended, signed February 9, 2007 (Monterey County Superior Court Case No. M66343).
3. Values shown in the table are based on reports to the Watermaster as received by MPWMD by July 15, 2011.
4. All values are rounded to the nearest tenth of an acre-foot. Where required, reported data were converted to acre-feet utilizing the relationships: 325,851 gallons = 43,560 cubic feet = 1 acre-foot.
5. Each producer's total authorized production allocation is the sum of Base Operating Yield Allocation and Carry Over from Prior Year and is taken from the Watermaster Producer Allocations for this Water Year.
6. Any minor discrepancies in totals are attributable to rounding.
7. APA = Alternative Producer Allocation; SPA = Standard Producer Allocation; CAW = California American Water.
8. The Marina Coast Water District supply of non-native water for the City of Seaside golf courses as In-lieu production to offset annually the City's balance of Replenishment Assessment is monitored but not calculated into quarterly water production.
9. CAW deducted transfer of 16.3 AF from Coastal Subarea to City of Seaside from first quarter production (transfer occurred 10/1 to 10/24/10).

SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN  
WATERMASTER

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Robert S. Jaques, Technical Program Manager  
MODIFIED AND APPROVED BY: Dewey D Evans, CEO

DATE: September 7, 2011

SUBJECT: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Findings and Conclusions Regarding  
Supplemental Water Supply Projects

-----  
**BACKGROUND:**

In its June and August, 2011 meetings the TAC reviewed a number of projects that were believed to have the potential to supplement the Regional Water Supply Project (desalination plant) that is being pursued by California American Water. The purpose of this assessment was to determine whether any of those projects should be pursued, supported, or promoted by the Watermaster in order to help resolve the water supply problems facing the residents and businesses that receive their water from the Carmel and Seaside Basins.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the TAC's assessment of this broad range of potential supplemental water supply projects, the TAC recommends that at this time the Watermaster not expend any funds or staff time to pursue or financially support any of these projects. However, the TAC also recommends that supplemental water supply projects be periodically reassessed to determine whether any conditions have changed that would warrant having the Watermaster expend funds or staff time to pursue or financially support any of those projects in the future.

**DISCUSSION**

**June 2011 TAC Meeting.**

The list of projects used by the Watermaster to develop its Replenishment Assessment unit cost, as well as those discussed in the Environmental Impact Report for CAW's Coastal Water Project, were reviewed and discussed by the TAC at its June 2011 meeting. The list of projects that was discussed is contained in Attachment A to this Agenda Transmittal.

The TAC's findings on each of these projects are briefly summarized below. The TAC felt that three of the projects (those highlighted in **boldface** in the list below) warranted further evaluation:

1. Moss Landing Desalination Plant – Local Alternative: The Regional Desalination project is still considered to be the most viable, so this project need not be considered.
2. **Moss Landing Desalination Plant – Regional Alternative:** The TAC wished to examine this project to see if any circumstances had changed that might make it more viable.
3. North Marina Desalination Plant – Local Alternative: The Regional Desalination project is still considered to be the most viable, so this project need not be considered.
4. North Marina Desalination Plant – Regional Alternative: The Regional Desalination project is still considered to be the most viable, so this project need not be considered.
5. MPWMD's 95-10 Desal Plant: This project is being evaluated by the MPWMD.

6. Sand City Water Supply Project: This project has been completed and is already in operation.
7. Salinas River Surface Water Treatment Plant: MCWRA reported that this project is not currently being actively pursued.
8. Regional Desalination: This project is being actively pursued by CAW, MCWRA, and MCWD.
9. **Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project**: This project is being pursued by MCWD and MRWPCA, however it has been moving forward at a relatively slow pace. The TAC wished to discuss the status of implementation of this project with representatives of those two agencies to see if the Watermaster could help expedite the project's implementation.
10. Seaside Aquifer Storage and Recovery Project: This project is partially completed and is actively being pursued by MPWMD and CAW.
11. MRWPCA Groundwater Replenishment Project for the Seaside Basin: This project is being pursued by MRWPCA. MRWPCA reported that work on the project was put temporarily on hold in 2009, but that work on it recently resumed.
12. Seawater Conversion Vessel: This project does not appear to be one that is being given serious consideration by any of the entities.
13. **Pacific Grove Stormwater Project**: The TAC felt that the concept of capturing and reusing storm water throughout the Peninsula area should be examined.
14. Conservation: MPWMD and CAW are actively pursuing this alternative.

In addition to selecting three projects from the list above, the TAC felt it would be worthwhile to examine these two additional projects/alternatives:

1. Pueblo Water Rights.
2. Modified pumping of existing production wells within the Seaside Basin and injecting water from those wells into new coastal wells to build a Coastal Injection Barrier. The purpose of this would be to build a freshwater mound to prevent seawater intrusion.

### **August 2011 TAC Meeting.**

At its August 2011 meeting the TAC further discussed the 5 projects that it felt warranted further evaluation at its June meeting (Project Nos. 2, 9, and 13, plus the additional alternatives Nos. 1 and 2) The TAC's findings on these 5 projects is briefly summarized below:

1. Project 2 (Regional Desalination Plant at the Kaiser Refractories Site): Following discussion there was consensus that this project did not warrant further investigation.
2. Project 9 (RUWAP): Following discussion there was consensus that there was little if anything the Watermaster could do to help expedite this project.
3. Project 13 (Regional Stormwater Reuse): Following discussion there was consensus that at this time this project did not warrant further investigation.
4. Additional Alternative 1 (Pueblo Water Rights): Following discussion there was consensus that this project did not warrant further investigation.
5. Additional Alternative 2 (Coastal Injection Barrier): Modeling to determine the possible benefits of such a project could be conducted within a matter of a few weeks, if seawater intrusion began to be detected. The Watermaster does not have the funds available to construct the necessary infrastructure that would include wells and pipelines, etc. for a coastal barrier project. Therefore, there was consensus that this project did not warrant further investigation at this time.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A: List of projects reviewed and discussed at the TAC's June 2011 meeting.

## **Attachment A: Description of Potential Supplemental Water Supplies**

The descriptions below were prepared in conjunction with development of the Water Year 2008-2009 Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost Calculations. Where more recent data was readily available, it has been added to the original descriptions, with the updated verbiage shown in *italics*.

1. Moss Landing Desalination Plant – Local Alternative: This is the only Moss Landing Desalination Plant alternative being considered in the CWP DEIR. It would produce 8,800 AFY, and all of this would be supplied to the CAW distribution system. It should not be included in the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost calculations because the Regional Desalination project is considered to be the most viable of the desalination projects.
2. Moss Landing Desalination Plant – Regional Alternative: This alternative is not being considered in the CWP DEIR, and should therefore not be included in the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost calculations.
3. North Marina Desalination Plant – Local Alternative: This is one of the alternative projects to the CAW Moss Landing Desalination Plant. It would be similar to the Moss Landing Desalination Plant alternative, but the desalination plant would be located in north Marina. It would produce 9,600 AFY, with 8,800 AFY going to the CAW distribution system and 800 AFY going to the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project (CSIP) to offset groundwater taken from the Salinas Basin by the desalination plant. It should not be included in the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost calculations because the Regional Desalination project is considered to be the most viable of the desalination projects.
4. North Marina Desalination Plant – Regional Alternative: This alternative is not being considered in the CWP DEIR, and should therefore not be included in the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost calculations.
5. MPWMD's 95-10 Desal Plant: This alternative is not being considered in the CWP DEIR, but it is still considered an active project by the MPWMD. It should not be included in the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost calculations because the Regional Desalination project is considered to be the most viable of the desalination projects. *The MPWMD contact for this project is Larry Hampson, and it is currently referred to as Water Project 3. Planning is for a small local desalination facility that could provide supplemental water supply (e.g., jurisdiction-planned future water use needs) for the Monterey Peninsula community. Currently, investigation is focused on a potential 2 MGD facility at the former Monterey Treatment Plant site across Del Monte Avenue from the Naval Postgraduate School. MPWMD may give a further update on the status and feasibility of this project at the TAC meeting.*
6. Sand City Water Supply Project: This project has been completed and is currently going through its testing phase. However, all of the water that is not needed for new connections within Sand City will be used by CAW to reduce the amount of water CAW takes from the Carmel River Basin, and thus it will not benefit the Seaside Basin. Therefore, this project should not be included in the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost calculations. *This project has been completed and is already in operation.*
7. Salinas River Surface Water Treatment Plant: This project is considered to be a Phase 1 component of what is now referred to simply as the "Regional Project" in the CWP DEIR. Unless it is learned that this is no longer a viable component of the Regional Project, it should continue to be included in the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost calculations. *MCWRA can give an update on the status and feasibility of this project.*
8. Regional Desalination: This project is the key Phase 1 component of what is now referred to simply as the "Regional Project" in the CWP DEIR. It would produce 10,500 AFY, with 8,800 AFY going to the CAW distribution system and 1,700 AFY to MCWD to offset groundwater taken from the Salinas Basin by the desalination plant. Therefore, this project should continue

to be included in the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost calculations. *Cal Am and MCWRA can give an update on the status and feasibility of this project.*

9. Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project: This project is considered to be a Phase 1 component of what is now referred to simply as the "Regional Project" in the CWP DEIR. The RUWAP is being pursued by MCWD and MRWPCA. Since it is an element of the Regional Project, it should continue to be included in the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost calculations.

*The RUWAP has an initial capacity of 1,727 AFY and an ultimate design capacity of 3,000 AFY.*

*Under the original design concept MRWPCA had completed the design of its portion of the RUWAP project, which consisted of the Recycled Water Pump Station and a short section of the recycled water transmission pipeline to the property line of the RTP. At that location the MCWD portion of the project, consisting of all of the other RUWAP facilities, e.g. transmission pipeline, turnouts to irrigation sites, pump stations, storage facilities, etc., was to connect to the recycled water transmission line.*

*With the implementation of the Salinas River Diversion Project's inflatable dam, a portion of the water going to the SVRP's treated water storage pond now includes river water as well as tertiary water from the SVRP. Because of this, as well as MCWD's desire to have better control over the operation of the system to serve customers located in the northern portion of the recycled water service area, design changes are being considered by MCWD's new design firm, Carollo Engineers who took over the design work from RMC. These changes may involve having the Recycled Water Pump Station located on MCWD property adjacent to the RTP, and having a gravity-flow intake pipeline to that pump station from a point in the system upstream of the SVRP's treated water storage pond. In addition a flow equalization pond may be included at the MCWD location in order to better match supply and demand levels. Right-of-way acquisition for the project is nearly complete*

*MCWD anticipates that user-agreements for parties that will be using recycled water from the Project will be prepared in conjunction with developers seeking to secure water to serve their projects. Due to the slowdown in the economy, and the commensurate slowing of development on the former Fort Ord, MCWD is not pressing ahead with implementation of the RUWAP at this time, but anticipates doing so when development resumes. In the meantime "purple pipe" (used to transmit recycled water) is being installed as a component of roadway and development projects on the former Fort Ord, for example in the recent reconstruction of a lengthy section of General Jim Moore Boulevard.*

*Although the RUWAP is listed as a Phase 1 project in the EIR for the Coastal Water Project, due to the reasons stated above there has only been modest recent progress made toward implementing it. A "Leadership Committee" was recently created involving Board members and managers from MCWD and MRWPCA to identify any areas that might help expedite the RUWAP.*

*With regard to financing for the project, MCWD has filed an application with the SWRCB for a State Revolving Fund (SRF) loan to help pay for the construction of the project, and the SWRCB informed MCWD that its project would qualify (be eligible for) such a loan. However, since the project is not ready to move into the construction phase no actual loan contract has been approved by or offered to MCWD by the SWRCB. Much of the funding for the RUWAP was, and still is, expected to come from development fees collected by FORA. However, with little development going on, there has not been the previously anticipated flow of development fees to help fund the project.*



*MCWD has expressed concerns to MRWPCA that the cost of water from the RUWAP will be too high to attract users. With the current lack of development within the area to be served by the RUWAP, MCWD does not consider the project to be financially viable at this time. MRWPCA has suggested phasing of construction of the project to serve the largest customers first, and also to Value Engineer the project, both for the purpose of seeking to lower the cost of water to the users.*

*In the meantime winter storage of recycled water may soon be evaluated to allow expanding the area served by the RUWAP to include the Laguna Seca and Pasadera golf courses in order to achieve a greater economy of scale to lower unit costs of water.*

*At the TAC meeting MRWPCA and MCWD may be able to provide a further update on the status and feasibility of this project.*

10. Seaside Aquifer Storage and Recovery Project: This project is considered to be a Phase 1 component of what is now referred to simply as the “Regional Project” in the CWP DEIR. The Seaside ASR Project is being pursued by MPWMD. When the October 2007 Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost was calculated the TAC concluded that, since all of the water production of this project will be used by CAW to reduce the amount of water CAW takes from the Carmel River Basin and thus it will not benefit the Seaside Basin, it should not be included in the calculation of the Seaside Basin Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost, and it was not included in the 2007 calculation. When the October 2008 Unit Cost calculation was prepared, this project was included in the calculation. There was no record in the TAC meeting minutes to explain why this project was included in 2008 when it had not been included in 2007. It was therefore concluded that including it in the 2008 calculation was an oversight, and that it should not be included in the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost calculations, even though it is an element of the Regional Project. *The MPMWD contact for this project is Joe Oliver. The Phase 1 (or Santa Margarita) project component is currently referred to as Water Project 1. The site is located on General Jim Moore Boulevard south of Eucalyptus Road in Seaside. All facilities for Phase 1 are not yet completely constructed, but the project has been operating in permanent status since it transitioned from a testing program in Water Year (WY) 2008.*

*The WY 2011 injection season, which ended May 31, achieved the highest single-year injection volume since MPWMD began injection operations in 2001 at the Water Project 1 site. During the injection season between December 1 and May 31, a total of 1,117 acre-feet (AF) of Carmel River Basin water was diverted, treated and transported through the California American Water (Cal-Am) supply distribution system and injected into the two specially-constructed ASR wells for storage in the Santa Margarita aquifer. The WY 2011 total is slightly greater than last year’s injection volume of 1,111 AF, and marks the second consecutive year that the estimated average annual project storage of 920 AF was exceeded.*

*This stored water will be extracted and delivered back into the Cal-Am distribution system for community use later this year, to reduce water-production related impacts to the Carmel River during the low-flow period. In addition to this site, the first ASR well is being developed at a second ASR site at the Seaside Middle School. This site is currently referred to as Water Project 2. This first ASR well has an estimated average annual storage of 500 AF and must be ready for injection operations before December 1, 2011 to comply with State Water Resources Control Board Order 2009-0060 (i.e., the Cease and Desist Order). MPWMD and Cal Am may give a further update at the TAC meeting.*

11. MRWPCA Groundwater Replenishment Project for the Seaside Basin: Based on information provided by MRWPCA during the development of the Seaside Basin Groundwater Model in

the Spring of 2009, the GWRP would be initially sized to provide 2,800 AFY to the Seaside Basin, and could potentially start-up in 2015. This estimated start-up date was based in part on the expectation that the GWRP would eventually be included as a Phase 1 component of the Regional Project. However, the CWP EIR listed the GWRP as a Phase 2 component of the Regional Project, and no time schedule for implementation of Phase 2 project components was presented in the CWP EIR. Since it is a Phase 2 component, it should not be included in the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost calculations. ***Work on the GWRP was put temporarily on hold in 2009. MRWPCA reported that work on the GWRP recently resumed.***

***Approximately \$200,000 is included in MRWPCA's FY 2011-2012 budget for pilot testing for the GWRP. MPWMD has expressed its support for the GWRP, and there had been discussions between MRWPCA and MPWMD regarding sharing in the costs for the pilot testing work. However, a recent decision by the PUC to limit the fees MPWMD can collect on the CAW water bills to fund certain of MPWMD's activities may reduce its ability to help financially support such projects. Consequently, the cost sharing concept is now on hold as MPWMD assesses the impacts of the PUC decision.***

***It appears that the California Department of Public Health is about to relax its previous requirements regarding the amount of dilution water that would be required for groundwater recharge projects involving recycled water, based on extensive testing and operational experience in the Orange County and West Basin projects.***

***MRWPCA is in discussions with General Electric Corporation with regard to the feasibility of establishing a public-private partnership to help finance the GWRP. One of General Electric's subsidiary companies manufactures membranes used in reverse osmosis technology and has expressed interest in being involved in the project.***

***MRWPCA can provide a further update on the status and feasibility of this project.***

12. Seawater Conversion Vessel: This project was listed, but not included, in the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost Calculation for Water Year 2008-2009, because there did not appear to be any sponsor for it. This appears to still be the case, so this project should not be included in the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost calculations. ***No new information was available on this project, but it does not appear to be one that is being given serious consideration by any of the entities.***
13. Pacific Grove Stormwater Project: This Project is listed in the CWP DEIR as a Phase 2 component of the Regional Project. No time schedule for implementation of Phase 2 project components was presented in the CWP DEIR. A feasibility study has reportedly been completed indicating that the City of Pacific Grove should pursue this project, which could produce an estimated 200 AFY of water. The estimated capital cost of the project, including engineering and construction, is reportedly \$13.2 million in 2008 dollars. No O&M cost estimate and no contingency percentage was provided. Using the same financing assumptions as were used for the Regional Project in Table 2, the Annualized Capital Cost of such a project, with no additional contingencies or other implementation costs added, would be approximately \$868,500. With a 200 AFY production capacity, this results in a unit cost of approximately \$4,340. Since it is a Phase 2 component, it should not be included in the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost calculations. ***Eric Sabolsice (of CAW) mentioned that he either had worked on or was aware of some additional study of what the water under this project would cost. He may be able to provide an update on that. Note: On a related topic, MPWMD prepared an evaluation of capturing and reusing storm water within its jurisdiction in 2000. If the TAC desires, that report can be placed on the agenda for a future TAC meeting to serve as a basis of discussing that topic.***

14. Conservation: Conservation was listed, but not included in the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost Calculation for Water Year 2008-2009, because there was no cost data for it. This appears to still be the case, so this project should not be included in the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost calculations. ***However, as Mr. Sabolsice mentioned at the last TAC meeting, Conservation may be one of the most cost-effective ways of reducing demands on the Seaside Basin, and is therefore quite worthy of continuing efforts.***

SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN  
WATERMASTER

**TO:** Board of Directors

**FROM:** Dewey D Evans, CEO

**DATE:** September 7, 2011

**SUBJECT:** Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD) Report of First and Second Quarter Water Year 2011, Groundwater-Quality and Groundwater-Level Data Collected for the Seaside Groundwater Basin

---

Due to the size of this document (70 pages) it has been decided that the entire report will be sent out separately from the Board's September 7, 2011 Board packet. The report will be sent out very close to the time the Board packet will be sent out.

Thanks,

Dewey D Evans  
CEO—Watermaster Office  
(831) 641-0113

**ITEM NO. XI.**

**DIRECTOR'S  
REPORTS**

**ITEM NO. XII.**

**EXECUTIVE OFFICER  
COMMENTS**